

NEW TYRANNIES FOR OLD

of similar interest

WHAT IS AHEAD OF US?

by G. D. H. Cole, Sir Arthur Salter,
Wickham Steed, Sidney Webb,
P. M. S. Blackett, Lancelot Hogben

DARE WE LOOK AHEAD?

by Bertrand Russell, Vernon Bartlett,
G. D. H. Cole, Sir Stafford Cripps,
Herbert Morrison, Harold J. Laski

**MAHARANA BHUPAL
COLLEGE,
UDAIPUR.**

Class No.....

Book No

NEW TYRANNIES FOR OLD

by

LORD SNELL

WICKHAM STEED

MAJOR-GENERAL

A. C. TEMPERLEY


GENEVIEVE TABOUISS

R. H. S. CROSSMAN

THE RT. HON.

HERBERT MORRISON

M.P.



LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD

MUSEUM STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN IN 1919

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. RIVAL IDEOLOGIES IN THEORY AND PRACTICE Lord Snell.	9
2. A NEW TECHNIQUE OF CONQUEST Wickham Steed	33
3. DANGER SPOTS IN EUROPE Major-General A. C. Temperley	66
4. THE CONFUSION OF WESTERN DEMOCRACY UNDER CAPITALIST DOMINATION Geneviève Tabouis	82
5. THE NEW DARK AGES? R. H. S. Crossman	130
6. WHEN AND HOW A RENAISSANCE? The Rt. Hon. Herbert Morrison, M.P.	148

RIVAL IDEOLOGIES IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Lord Snell

APART from the purely physical differences in structure and habit, the most noticeable distinction between civilized men and the animal kingdom, is that the habits of men appear to be influenced by their conceptions of the nature of the universe, and by their attitude towards their social environment. Animals see the physical things about them—and, perhaps no more than that. They appear to accept their surroundings as they find them, and only rarely do they combine in an effort to change them.

Men appear to see a little further than that. They have an uncertain vision of the whole of which they are a part, and they sometimes reach out towards a reality which they feel exists but which they cannot grasp. This divine discontent in men manifests itself in all kinds of associated effort to shape the social environment in which they live in accordance with the pattern of the ideal which exists in their minds.

These ideologies have enormous transforming power, and they frequently so change men that, from dull clods of wayward clay, they appear to undergo a kind of second birth and become the willing and tireless agents

of the "stern, remorseless, sweet idea" which has captured their imaginations. Unsuspected stores of moral and creative energy are released in them and they not infrequently become intolerable bores, of whom is the salt of the earth.

Our British Socialist movement was founded and nurtured by men and women of this type. There are other illustrations in both religious and secular history. Under the energizing influence of an idea, David the shepherd boy becomes King of Israel, Mahomet, the young camel driver of Arabia, establishes the religion of Islam, Columbus discovers America, and the abolitionists abolish slavery.

As of men, so of communities. Sometimes whole nations surrender themselves to a racial idea, a patriotic ambition or a political programme. And the idea that moves them may be neither true nor noble. Mass hysteria is only rarely discriminative. The victims of a captivating ideology consistently drive it through all the facts and they are quick to stone anyone imprudent enough to try to disturb their illusions. Until comparatively recently, every healthy American believed that his country was immune from those cycles of economic depression that attacked other lands. He believed that "God's own country," America the golden, was assured of increasing and undisturbed progress; and the economic student who was not convinced was not argued with or refuted, he was just pitied and ignored.

We English people have also lived in a similar illusory

world. Our fathers were convinced that, whatever blunders they made, Providence would see them through. They were "God's Englishmen." We are not so certain as they were on that point. Ideology of this kind may be a most dangerous illusion. Rudyard Kipling, who wrote much patriotic nonsense, declared that we were "well assured that on our side, the abiding oceans fight," and that "God hath smote for us a pathway to the ends of all the earth."

The strength—and the menace—of rival ideologies is the dominant factor in current political phenomena. In Germany National Socialism has become a secular religion with a home-made Messiah. The Germans have—so they declare—superseded the Jewish race as the chosen people; though why God, with such a wide field of selection, should have chosen either of these races, heaven alone knows. Personally, if I have to choose between the prophet Isaiah and, say, General Goering, my reaction will be that of an unaccustomed and unqualified orthodoxy.

It is not only in the totalitarian states of Europe that this dangerous ideology of racial superiority prevails. Japan swaggers, and staggers, under the double affliction of ancestor worship and monarchical idolatry.

Between the totalitarian states there exists no irreconcilable rivalry, because they are all based upon the same fundamental ideas; the real, the permanent and unappeasable rivalry is between them and the ideology of the democratic countries of Europe, the United

States of America, and the British dominions. The differences that divide the totalitarian and the democratic states are not only in the form, but also in the aim and purpose of government. The aim of Democracy is the happiness and the freedom of the individual; the totalitarian ideology involves both the suppression of individual liberties and the uncriticized domination of the State. The ancient despotic kings said "I am the State," Hitler, Mussolini, and the whole brood of tyrants say, "We are the State, and the people must do our will." "Governments," declares the Declaration of Independence, "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." That is the very heart and purpose of Democracy; it is for us at this time the law and the prophets; it is the Ten Commandments all in one, and it is that for which we shall fight until we have all died and ended.

Let me give an additional emphasis to the kinship of those ideas which are fundamental in the totalitarian states. They all believe that the end justifies the means; in all of them a section rule over a coerced and subdued whole. All of them rule by violence; all of them pervert the human soul to the decisions of a ruling oligarchy deified as the State, and all of them either imprison, excommunicate, or "liquidate" those who retain and exercise any quality of independent judgment.

Agreeing as they do in the fundamental ideas of government, the dictators do not greatly differ in method. Whether his name be Stalin, Mussolini, or

Hitler—the totalitarian ruler, does not say to his victims, "You must obey me because I am a superman, a god." He secures their obedience by fear and deception. He dopes them with false doctrines. He says to his coerced audience: "I am saving your State; I am delivering you from outside enemies; I am showing them that you are the greatest people on earth. I will see to it that you recover your lost territory and that the thieves who robbed you shall be punished." The misled peoples devour this poisoned fare as eagerly as hungry cats drink milk. It is amazing that grown-up men and women are often more childish than are children. A child always preserves his self-respect. I have never known a child to believe that flogging is good for him, and he never licks the rod that hurts him. Children never lie to themselves and pretend that they prefer slavery to freedom, and the more I see of parents the more I respect their frank and engaging offspring.

The peoples of the dictator states cannot possibly adore their rulers for their intellectual eminence or for their lofty moral attainments. The successful dictator must always be a pernicious mixture "of the killing lion and the faithless fox." Those that we know are true to type. Their contribution to the human inheritance is not that of higher standards of personal behaviour nor some welcome achievement in art or literature. They have resurrected primitive hatreds, re-created the spy and encouraged the sneak, and they have put back, if not actually stopped, the clock of progress.

New Tyrannies for Old

The dictators have also altered world values by the creation of a new religion of racial primacy. But they and their fellow conspirators are not eternal. They are the products of the troubled age in which we live. When nations boil the scum always rises to the top. They, like everything else that lives, are the sport of change and decay:

“Like the flies of later Spring
That lay their eggs and sting and sting
They have their day and pass away.”

What should be the attitude of the democratic peoples to the totalitarian ideologies of our time? Should it be acceptance, indifference or resistance? All of the dictator states claim that they are the pioneers of a finer civilization; that they have produced complete unity within their own territories, and if spiritual death is unity the claim may be allowed. Japan asserts that her civilizing mission in China is to deliver that great people from the rule of Russian Communism, and both Hitler and Mussolini are civilizing Spain at the present time.

Let us look at the various totalitarian systems in the order of their appearance. Russia began a system of totalitarianism which Italy copied and Germany imitated. Historically, Fascism was a counter-revolution to Communism, and its method was much the same. Communism aimed to “liquidate” the hated bourgeoisie, Fascism to liquidate or imprison the left-wing propagandist. In this questionable field of

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice

In endeavour, Italian Fascism was an easy winner, because the Russian bourgeoisie still exists, but the Italian socialist-propagandist does not.

Let us at this point try to get these modern outbursts of authoritarianism into their proper relation in the scheme of things. Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler were not adventurers of a new kind, nor is authoritarianism a new political phenomenon. The histories of ancient Greece and Rome are packed with the records of dictators, and the modern European type are as common in South America as are the revolutions that establish or overthrow their rule. Napoleon was an adventurer dictator and we have had our own Cromwell.

In considering both the theory and the record of the Russian revolution three things must be kept in mind, viz. the unbroken despotic tradition of the country; its place in the then existing civilization; and the complete absence of any experience in the practice of democratic government. The Russian revolution was heir to the temper and methods of the Czarist regime, and it is therefore not surprising that its early practice showed the source from which it came.

Why was the soil of the post-war Europe so fertile in the production of the current type of dictator-ruler? Dr. G. P. Gooch has summarized the situation then prevailing, in lines which I commend to your close attention:

"The extremity of the world's sickness to-day arises

New Tyrannies for Old

from the combination and interaction of political passions, economic misery, and psychological strain. In the field of politics the dictated treaties added to the inevitable bitterness of defeat; forced cessions of territory smarted like the amputations of a limb; armies of occupation were an ever-present humiliation; military and financial controls entrenched in the capitals of vanquished states were a perpetual reminder of a foreign yoke; the attribution of sole guilt for the outbreak of war to the losing side, outraged the feelings of peoples deeply convinced that they had fought for their existence against malevolent foes. The Continent was sundered into two camps: the victors determined to keep what they had won; the vanquished longing to recover all or part of what they had lost. . . . The conflict left a continent in ruins, as if a tornado had swept across the land."¹

We should also remember, when we criticize these authoritarian ideologies, that in one of the states concerned, Democracy in any form had never existed, and that in the others it had not had the necessary time to strike deep roots. We have behind our own fumbling efforts in self-government, centuries of steady development towards democratic responsibility and administrative experience. We are trained to the habit of demand and of compromise, and tolerance of opinions which differ from our own, fits us like a well-cut garment.

¹ *Dictatorship in Theory and Practice*, pp. 4-5.

Let us also try more clearly to understand what revolutions are and what they imply. Generally speaking, they represent the sudden liberation of forces that have been too long suppressed; and it is not impossible that violent episodes may have a helpful influence in the development of civilization. I am not an engineer, but I believe that the power of the internal combustion engine is derived from a continuous process of explosions, of which we are painfully reminded by the machine-gun noise of the passing motor-cycle, and it may be that social development is helped by similar disturbing forces.

The Russian revolution of 1917 was the first of the series that we are considering, and it was long overdue. If ever a regime merited destruction—even with violence, it was that of the Russian Czars. It was a blight upon the earth and its crimes cried aloud for redress. Our contemporary bourgeois society complains bitterly of the alleged excesses of the new Soviet system; but the moral sensitiveness of a world which accepted without protest the system which the Soviets destroyed is altogether unconvincing.

The Soviet experiment will have a definite place in the history of social development. It has inspired and it has repressed. We all have in our minds "the dark shadow of the Moscow trials" and many other deplorable incidents. These may have been a "tragic hang-over" not only from the Czarist practice, but also from the disturbances of the civil war. "Russia," say the

New Tyrannies for Old

Webbs, "was in the matter of morals and civilization very much where Britain and France stood in 1700." There had never been in Russia, either general toleration or individual freedom. The Czars ruled with the knout, exile, and the scaffold, and Lenin for different ends continued practices that he had inherited. Men do not gather grapes from thorns nor figs from thistles.

I have never been able to accept the theory of Russian Communism, and I am certain that in its earliest zeal it was the very reverse of what we mean by Democracy, and some of its actions have created in the minds of Socialists throughout the world embarrassment if not complete disillusionment. But Communist practice is not static, and it is gradually, but continuously, modifying its administration and extending the liberties of the Russian people. The new constitution is admittedly a great political document, and from it much additional freedom may come.

My chief difficulty in regard to Communist theory is its claim to sanctity and finality. It is rigid, and to question it is to commit a sin against the eternal verities. Marxian ideology is regarded as the ark of the Soviet covenant, to be looked upon with awe and obeyed, but not to be modified or questioned. Lenin declared that "every revolutionary movement must have a revolutionary theory" and that Soviet theory is based on the philosophy of Karl Marx. As Mr. F. A. Voigt points out in his very able but painfully biased

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice

book *Unto Caesar*, Communism claims not only to be truth, but to be "The Truth." For thousands of years men struggled in complete darkness. Great teachers came and went, but not until Marx arrived, with his inverted Hegelianism, was "The Truth" known to the world. Well, that is where I get off.

The Russian ideology is based upon a theoretical dogma which, in some respects, and particularly in its attitude to the State, is in direct opposition to our Socialist outlook. The aim of Communism is to abolish the State: the aim of Socialism is continuously to adapt it to our needs. Lenin declared that "the more democratic the State . . . the more rapidly does it begin to wither away. While the State exists there is no freedom. When there is freedom there will be no State," and Stalin at the Sixteenth Congress of the U.S.S.R. said that "we are for the withering away of the State . . . to keep on developing the State in order to prepare the conditions for the withering away of State power; that is the Marxist formula."¹ Thus, the State, like the frog in the fable, is to be inflated until it bursts, because "when there is only one class left, it will wither away." The theory of Russian Communism is therefore not one that Socialists of our outlook and training can accept.

In practice it seeks to establish a new economic order, and this constitutes its sole claim to uniqueness. It is related to Fascism both in thought and method:

¹ Quoted by Herbert Read, *Poetry and Anarchism*, pp. 73, 74.

New Tyrannies for Old

"Both seek to remould society by enabling a single party to capture the machine of the State by revolutionary violence, and both rest upon an emotional rather than upon an intellectual basis. The emotion of the Fascist is racial nationalism stirred to vigour by the violence of the communist attack on the bourgeois and national tradition, and partly by a sense of unjust treatment or unfulfilled racial destiny."¹

The emotion of the Communist is that of class resentment against the expropriating classes. Both of them are Messianic in outlook; and, as Mr. F. A. Voigt has remarked, both have enthroned the will of the collective man above the individual conscience and, judged by the pragmatic test, the authoritarianism of Italy and Germany is as true as is the Communism of Russia.

The Fascism of Italy comes second in historical sequence and it, too, can be traced back to the teaching of Hegel. The great German thinker sought to establish the hegemony of the Spirit or the Idea. Marx stood this theory on its head and upon it he based his teaching of the dominance of the proletariat in the State. Mussolini was not consciously indebted to Hegel; his teachers, as Dr. Finer has shown in his interesting book *Mussolini's Italy*, were Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Sorel, and Machiavelli. His cue for action was, however, the example of the Russian revolution. Pretending to hate its theories, he copied its methods.

¹ *Round Table*, June 1938.

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice

The ideal and the immediate aim of Mussolini was threefold in character: a single political party, complete and unopposed, a wholly totalitarian state, and a period of fabricated high tension under the cover of which he could subdue the people to his will. Allow me again to quote the words of Dr. G. P. Gooch in order to show the similarity of technique in the three totalitarian states that I am considering:

"A single man is in effective control of the machine; the party of which he is the head imposes its will in every department of national life. The people are not asked what they desire, but receive what the superman thinks fit to provide. The Press is transformed into a gramophone, eternally grinding out the Government tune. Crushing penalties fall on actual or potential foes. The individual citizen, with his traditional rights, his personality, disappears. The State alone counts, working at high pressure with the remorseless drive of a machine."¹

Mussolini's apologists and admirers in this country naively inform us that their hero came to the Italian people as a rare gift of Providence; that they were rescued from social chaos by the modest and self-effacing leader who still defends them against the corrupting influence of European social democracy, and British Fascists await with impatience the day when a similar deliverer will appear in our own land.

¹ *Dictatorship in Theory and Practice*, p. 15.

New Tyrannies for Old

There was, however, very little of the hero about Mussolini. What he led in Italy was not a revolution but a *coup d'état*. None of the hardships of long marches or the dangers of the barricades for him. He had a more restful technique. The saviour of Italy advanced upon Rome valiantly and implacably in the fierce discomfort of a sleeping car, run by workmen whose liberties he stole and whose leaders lie "liquidated."

Moreover, if, as is alleged, anarchy prevailed in Italy, why should Mussolini of all people have been shocked by it? He was, and probably still is, an anarchist himself. His declared aim was not to strengthen the State, but to destroy it. Two years before he so laboriously descended upon Rome—on April 6, 1920—according to Professor Borghese on whose interesting book on Italy I have drawn for this chapter—Mussolini declared that: "I start from the individual and strike at the State. Down with the State in all its forms and incarnations. The State of yesterday and of to-morrow, the bourgeois State and the Socialist State. In the gloom of to-day and the darkness of to-morrow, the only faith that remains to us as individuals destined to die, is the at present absurd but ever-consoling religion of anarchy."¹

The adorers of Mussolini in our own country do not ask him to trouble his conscience with enquiries as to whether his noisy affirmations of to-day are consistent with his certitudes of yesterday. Enough for them is the

¹ Borghese, *Goliath*, p. 224.

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice

fact that he suppressed for others the liberties that he once claimed for himself. Having begun his career by hating both rulers and tyrants, he changed his mind when he saw a chance of becoming both.

Machiavelli, who was Mussolini's prophet and teacher, is said to have had a dream in which he chose to go to hell where he was sure of good company, rather than face the dullness of heaven where he was sure of a good climate. His modern disciple may have no choice in the matter. Mussolini, as Dr. Borghese has affirmed, extolled motherhood not because motherhood is holy in itself, but because it produces soldiers, and he has temporized with the Roman Church, not because that Church was the body of the living Christ, but because it was Roman and imperial, and because it provided an anaesthetic for the wounded soldier.¹

We are asked to admire the improvements that he has made in Rome and other cities, and in so far as they add to the civic beauties of Italian cities we do admire them. But, if you will give to me in London the powers that Mussolini had in Rome, I will make changes such as would show him to be but a slothful amateur.

In practice Mussolini aims, by establishing himself in East Africa, and by making Spain an outpost of world Fascism on the coast of Europe, to endanger the security of both France and the British Commonwealth. This is not the occasion to examine the working of the

¹ See Borghese, *Goliath*, p. 29².

Fascist experiment in Italy itself. There are doubtless gains to record as well as losses to lament, but things do not appear to be going too well. Mussolini's German partner has already deceived him. Perhaps he already reflects upon the advice given by his master—Machiavelli:

"A prince must be careful never to make company with one more powerful than he in attacking others, unless necessity compels him . . . because once they have won, he remains at the discretion of the stronger, and being at the discretion of others is what princes should shun to the utmost of their power."¹

And because Mussolini neglected this advice, the Italian people know that the *pickelhaube* can once more be seen on the Brenner Pass.

When we turn from the Italian to the German theory and practice of totalitarianism, we leave the deplorable for the contemptible. In Italy Fascism is only departmentally authoritarian. It has not, to the same degree, succumbed to Hitler's mad delirium of race. It does not ascribe to itself supernatural attributes. German National Socialism is a national, although a secular, religion; and it is characteristically intolerant and fanatical. The Italian people have already a religion of their own, and they do not propose to make a Pope of Mussolini. There is at present, no vacancy.

Hitler was not the originator of the German Nazi

¹ Quoted by Borghese, *Goliath*, p. 380.

1111

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice.

system to the same degree that the Italian system was created by Mussolini. He has neither Mussolini's brains nor his constructive power. He is a demagogue who was thrown up by a world situation. Dr. Gooch points out how the Treaty of Versailles had wounded a proud and defeated nation, and it is notorious that no one is so filled with self-pity as the thwarted bully. The Germans, trained to humiliate other peoples, were themselves unaccustomed to it. Thus the importation by France of black troops wounded them to the quick. Economic distress followed political disaster and the collapse of the mark subjected the middle classes to ruin and the German workers to dire poverty. Then in 1930 the great economic blizzard struck an already exhausted people, and they lost their self-control. They were adrift in a stormy and uncharted sea and they were waiting for a lead. Hitler caught their attention at the favourable moment; he filled the air with promises and from him the despairing youth of Germany heard again the old German note of mastery. "Follow me and I will save you. I will avenge you. You were never defeated. You were stabbed in the back by Marxists and by Jews. I will make you once again a great nation and your enemies shall be your footstool."

The German people, who have always had a slave mentality, heard him with gladness, and accepted without resistance his leadership. The old German Social Democratic Party, which affected to despise the bourgeois non-Marxian empiricism of the British

New Tyrannies for Old

Socialist Movement, collapsed like a deflated paper bag.

Since August 1934, Hitler has been at the head of the German State. In what respect has Germany been improved? She has gained Adolf Hitler and she has lost her soul, and in the place of the old free Germany, the revered home of science, music, and philosophy, she has descended to the practice of a crude tribal idolatry. The liberal Constitution of Weimar has been suppressed, there is a drilled and subservient Reichstag, which registers without debate or question whatever is placed before it, inconvenient colleagues have been "liquidated," the courts are the obedient tools of the executive, and Germany's once famous universities are to-day mere nurseries of Nazi ideology and propaganda.

There have been bloodier revolutions than the German revolution, but there has never been a meaner one. No Jew had ever wronged Adolf Hitler, but under his racial fanaticism the German people, who loved and honoured Goethe, revered Kant, and who produced a long line of musicians and philosophers, applaud the wrongs done in their name to a race which, is at least as great as their own. The current ideology of Germany is described for us by General Goering:

"We Nazis believe that in political affairs Adolf Hitler is infallible, just as the Roman Catholic believes that in religious matters the Pope is infallible. His will is my law."¹

¹ *Germany Reborn.*

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice

The ideology of Nazism is the domination of the State over individual freedom, and the justification of power as the deciding factor in national policy. "The important thing," said Gocbbels, "is not who is right, but who wins." Rosenberg has declared that "the race-bound national soul is the measure of all our thoughts and aspirations, the final criterion of values," while Rust, the Reich Cultus Minister, at the 350th anniversary of Heidelberg University, affirmed that "we will never teach impartially, but only as Germans." Three hundred years previously the same university invited the excommunicated Jew Benedict Spinoza to go to Heidelberg where it guaranteed him freedom of teaching. The contrast between these two occasions represents the cultural decline and fall of a people who once loved truth and freedom.

I have already suggested to you that no matter how greatly these totalitarian states differ from each other in day-to-day practice, there is between them a basic unity, and one of the grim possibilities of the future is that they may make common cause against the democracies of the world. This relationship is apparent even in their organization of leisure. Kraft durch Freude in Germany and Dopolavoro in Italy are, as Mr. E. H. Carr has pointed out,¹ "as like one another as two pins." Then, although Germany never aimed as did Russia to produce a classless society, her Nazi schools and labour camps are actually doing precisely that. It

¹ *Spectator*, September 16, 1938.

New Tyrannies for Old

must grieve Communist theorists to reflect that the original untainted Soviet faith was to secure "the withering away of the State" and that Stalin is now advocating "the highest development of the power of the State."¹ Mr. Carr remarks that the philosophy of these totalitarian states is full of totem words such as the "proletariat" and "*das volk*" and that in all of them "the central authority, masquerading now as the State, now as the Party, holds the reins." The rivalry which exists between these states is therefore superficial and it may prove to be only a temporary condition.

The rivalry which is fundamental and irreconcilable, is that which exists between totalitarianism in all its forms and the ideology and practice of Democracy. Between these two conflicting views of life there never has been, and there never can be peace. What then shall we do? How must the danger to the whole system of political and civic liberties which have been won by centuries of trial and error be met? I suggest that our first duty is to avoid participation in the ideological war which is now proceeding between Fascism and Communism and, with all our strength, prepare to defend our own freedom. "Evil men and impostors shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. But abide thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of."²

What do these totalitarian experiences suggest to our minds? Is it not that we must be increasingly vigilant

¹ Quoted by E. H. Carr.

² II Timothy iii. 13-14.

lest this authoritarian philosophy infects our own people? I am alarmed at what looks like sympathy in high places with authoritarian pretensions, and I feel convinced that "the best people" among us would rather that Spain were Fascist than that she were free.

In its present form our own Democracy is a varying balance "between the idea of the popular will and the idea of a sovereign authority." It unites the practice of parliamentary control with a strong executive, and the individual freedom which it provides is one of the most precious conditions of our national life. All our thoughts and practice, all our hopes and labours are associated with it, and all our culture—political, social, and moral—have that as its basis.

Between these two alternative systems of life we must, sooner or later, make our choice. One is that government exists to transform society into some ideal pattern of life approved by and controlled by the people. The other is that the people exist to do the will of whatever usurper may be in power. The hour for decision as between these two views of life is now upon us. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

Will Democracy prevail? I think that it will. We see its weaknesses plainly enough, but are there no weaknesses in the authoritarian states behind the false façade of bluster which they erect to deceive us? By way of encouragement let us remember, as Dr. David Muzzey has reminded us, that it took four hundred or five hundred years for the nationalistic form of society

New Tyrannies for Old

to develop out of the old feudalism and ecclesiasticism of the Middle Ages. It was then something of a blessing; we have allowed it to develop on wrong lines and it is now a danger to the very spirit of development.

Democracy is so strongly set in our soil that its roots will not easily be torn up. Let us therefore not succumb to an enervating depression of the spirit and the will. Ecclesiastes said many centuries ago that "the clouds return after the rain"; but I say to you in the dark days in which we are living, that the clouds will pass, and the sun will renew the life of the world.

We need, however, to beware of the authoritarian spirit which is always operating through constitutional forms—passing a law here, and there endorsing a departmental encroachment. Mayfair is choked with "drawing-room" Fascists, and I sometimes fear that the philosophical distance between Machiavelli and our Prime Minister is not so great as Mr. Chamberlain himself believes. For all practical purposes his Government has been a powerful ally of the Franco rebellion.

We may have to reconsider very carefully whether we are using our heritage in a proper way. Our fathers believed that a special sanction attached to mass opinion. The voice of the people was to them the voice of God. But whose voice is it to-day? It is in great part a doctored and perverted voice. The voice of Lord Beaverbrook or of Lord Rothermere may not be the voice of God.

The fact is that if we want Democracy to prevail we

Rival Ideologies in Theory and Practice

must produce human beings desirous and fit to serve it. Remember that "ideas as well as kings can abdicate."

Fascism must be met by a call to youth which is as powerful as its own. What is that call to be? Toryism is a philosophy of negation; Liberalism is a darning and patching of the decaying capitalist fabric, and both of them have to be exasperated into activity. So what?

With what device can we recapture the minds of youth? Liberty of the individual appears to be a possession which they accept with a dangerous disregard. Born and reared in a period of war and horror they have lost the power of moral indignation. What is the awakening ideology to be? I wonder whether the idealism, the romantic pull of an ideal social environment in which the human soul could grow and rejoice which, when we were young, was as a light about our feet, would not rekindle in the youth of our time all the glow of those great days.

Democracy has been defined as "the government of the people by the middle classes with the permission of the vested interests"; but it may mean much more than that if we understand and use it rightly. We may have to prepare our citizens for Democracy as they are prepared for their daily vocations. We do not wish so to educate young people that they become the prey of the caucus or the party boss. But it is equally dangerous to leave them unprepared, lest they lapse into vanities and self-indulgence, and liable to be swept away into

a servile enthusiasm such as we lament in Germany and elsewhere.

If we wish the end—which is the preservation and the growth of free representative institutions—we must will the means to achieve it. In sober truth we may have misled both youth and ourselves. We accepted from our fathers the assurance that liberty had been won and that on its sure foundations we could rest in peace. We were foolishly, tragically wrong. We have been taught by grim experience that, as Mr. Gilbert Seldes has pointed out, liberty is not a sacred stone in the wall of an enduring temple. We have too slowly realized that its preservation depends not only upon eternal vigilance, but also upon eternal growth and increase. It is not a settled legacy which passes on unimpaired from the past to the future. Liberty is a priceless possession which each generation has to win for itself by its own stern endeavour. “Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.” We have chosen the ideology of the free soul in a free state. Let us see to it that it is so served that it cannot fail.

A NEW TECHNIQUE OF CONQUEST

Wickham Steed

THE subject of this paper was suggested to me as long ago as last May. It was proposed that I should discuss "A New Technique of Conquest." At that moment few of us supposed that before the time should come for this paper to appear the new technique of conquest would have been exemplified in very striking fashion. It is true that Austria had just been suppressed. It is true that many were then predicting that within a few weeks or months Czecho-Slovakia would be strangled or dismembered. But the public in general thought that these predictions were wide of the mark; and some of us imagined, after what happened on May 21, 1938, that the danger of the application of this new technique to the one remaining free and democratic state in Central Europe would be deferred, or if not deferred would certainly be unsuccessful because it would be met by the firm resolve of the other European democracies and of Soviet Russia. It looked like that. To-day we know it was not like that, and we may have to ask why.

Before asking why it will be well to cast our minds back to the beginnings of this technique. In essence it is not entirely new. It was adopted in the years before

the War, at least as regards propaganda, secret influence, financial pressure, and military threat. But it had not then attained the rank and style of the technical expression of a new political philosophy and mode of action. This has come comparatively late; as far as Germany is concerned since 1933. Still, the makings of this technique were already present in pre-War Europe, and their development was only retarded because in those days some countries understood that if their own freedom was to be preserved, it must be defended.

In those days, too, no one really challenged the worth of freedom. Even Imperial Germany possessed a considerable degree of freedom. The largest party in the German Reichstag was the Social-Democratic Party. There existed a number of independent newspapers; and if, in many respects, there was not exactly freedom of political action, there was full freedom of political criticism. Behind the façade of German policy lay a great plan, a great aspiration, for the domination of Central and South-Eastern Europe and ultimately of the world. True, this domination seemed improbable. Even in Germany the idea of it was criticized, and after the Great War it seemed to be a very distant danger. It was then that the new technique came really into being and into play.

It is essential for any understanding of this new technique to remember to how great an extent calculated and deliberate untruth forms its essence. How did Hitler, the chief exponent of the technique, gain his

A New Technique of Conquest

power? And, we must add, Goebbels. It was because Hitler knew how to appeal to the secret and wounded vanity of the German people. Here I am not drawing upon my observation only. Evidence for my statement can be found in the remarkable book *The Eve of 1914* by Herr Theodor Wolff, formerly editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*; in another remarkable book, that by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, *Germany Puts the Clock Back*, and also in the book by Stephen Roberts, *The House that Hitler Built*. All attest the fact that the main appeal of Hitler to the mass-mind of Germany lay in the balm he offered for the rankling wound or at least the aching void caused by loss of faith in the military invincibility of Germany. Theodor Wolff, a German Liberal, puts it quite simply. (I am quoting from memory the sense of his statement, not his actual words.) "We had become so accustomed to believe that our Army and our rulers possessed the secret of military invincibility that we were quite content to let them manage our affairs. We were rather like shareholders in a prosperous company who do not bother the directors as long as dividends are paid. But when we saw, after four and a half years of war, that defeat had overtaken us, our belief in the military invincibility of Germany was shattered. It was a belief which had grown up since the battle of Leipzig in 1813, then, after Bismarck had assumed control of Prussia, through the victorious war against Denmark in 1864, the victorious war against Austria in 1866, the victorious war against France in 1870-71—and the

wound to the deepest feelings of the German people was very deep and almost incurable."

It may be asked, "But what about the Weimar Republic? Surely the people in the Weimar Republic did not entertain any of these ideas?" I can only give the evidence of a former German statesman under the Weimar Republic. I will not name him or give a clue to his identity because he is still alive and, perhaps, not beyond the reach of Nazi vengeance. When one of my friends, who had known him well in the days of his power and saw him after he had taken refuge in a neutral country, asked him: "But why did you people leave all the old officials, all the old officers, all the old paraphernalia of the Prussian State in being? Surely it was impossible, you must have known it, to build up a really free and democratic Germany with that framework round you?" The answer was, "You are right; but we were all so obsessed by the idea of revenge that we thought that these people alone could give it us." By "revenge" he meant restoration of German belief in the invincibility of German arms.

Then came Hitler who said simply: "It is a lie to say that we were defeated. We were everywhere victorious. On every battlefield we triumphed." (And remember that the German people were not allowed to know that there had been a battle of the Marne until the War was over.) "On every battlefield we triumphed. We should have won the War in a very few weeks or months had we not been stabbed in the back by Marxists, Jews, and

A New Technique of Conquest

traitors. They betrayed us. They betrayed our victorious troops, of whom I—Hitler—was one.” And this balm to the soul of the German people was very efficacious. They said, “It is true; we were not defeated.” And then when Hitler added, “Germany, awake! Follow me. Down with the Jews! Down with the socialists! Down with traitors! I will lead you again to glorious destinies.” Ah, they thought, this may be true. And we cannot say to-day that their belief was entirely ill-founded.

Hitler is a man of very considerable power. I have never belittled either his hold upon the German people or his importance as a phenomenon in German life. He has a deep instinctive knowledge of the German masses, and especially of two classes which had not before been fully exploited in public life, the class of big business, fearing to lose its gains and opportunity of gain, and the small middle-class, the *petite bourgeoisie* and their fear of being submerged into the ranks of the proletariat from which they had, perhaps painfully, escaped a generation before—Hitler’s own case. Against the mass of the proletariat, or so-called proletariat, organized in the Social-Democratic Party, Hitler mobilized the feelings of the small middle-class, the small man, and let loose a force which the Social-Democrats had never understood. And this linking up of the interests of big business and, to a certain extent, of large landowners with the desires and fears of the small bourgeoisie was one of the secrets of Hitler’s power. Then, of course, he drew upon one of the most

potent reserves of political violence that can be found in any country, certainly in any European country, and perhaps even in the United States—anti-Semitism. A number of Germans had tried to exploit that feeling before. I am old enough to remember the diatribes of Court Chaplain Stöcker in the nineties of last century, or the tirades which brought the anti-Semitic agitator Ahlwardt into the Reichstag. These early German anti-Semites appealed to the underlying feelings of envy and fear in the German people. After the War Hitler mobilized those feelings; and if we would understand the importance of this new technique we must recognize that this appeal can become potent in any country if once freedom of opinion, freedom of public meeting, individual liberty, and respect for the human personality, are suppressed.

Let us therefore look with interest if not with respect upon this new technique of falsehood as a method of attaining and keeping political power. Then let us admire the extremely skilful method by which the technique was applied. In what did this method really consist? It was simply: First make friends with, or appear to make friends with, then bamboozle, then undermine the position of, your prospective victim before you strike him. That is the essence of the method. See how Hitler and his comrades practised it.

When old Field-Marshal von Hindenburg called Hitler to power his advent was severely criticized in the Socialist Press in Germany and abroad. Even the

A New Technique of Conquest

Liberal Press did not like it. The Catholic Press of Germany was more or less on the fence. So Hitler said to the Social-Democratic leaders of Germany: "Don't criticize me; I am not against you. I am only against the Communists. And please send people abroad to tell your comrades there not to criticize me. Our party is National-Socialist; help us to keep public opinion abroad friendly, and we will work with you for our joint and common Socialist aims." And they helped him. But before the emissaries could get back their leaders at home were in prison or in concentration camps. Hitler has always trodden upon and kicked, if he has not killed, those who have helped him, after he has duped them.

Then, as you may remember, Hitler, Goering, and the others, having no majority in the Reichstag, hit upon a magnificent idea—that of burning the Reichstag and saddling the arson upon the Communists. It was a curious coincidence that on the night of the Reichstag fire more than four thousand people were arrested for complicity in the crime, and arrested on the strength of warrants bearing the photographs of these persons, the warrants having, by some miracle, been prepared within an hour or two of the blaze of the Reichstag! Or can they have been got ready beforehand? At any rate, the arrests were made and most of Hitler's enemies were under lock and key.

Then, with the whole of Germany aghast and agog, asking "What does it mean?" Hitler appealed to the

Centre or Catholic Party and said: "Work with us, help us. We only need full powers for four years. You will see how then we shall protect religion and morality. Work with us. Give us these full powers." The Centre or Catholic Party voted Hitler full powers, believing, for the moment, that he was only against the godless Socialists and Communists. And a short time afterwards it was alleged that there was some blemish in the financial administration of Catholic organizations. A Nazi campaign was started against the leaders of the Centre Party. One after the other they had to flee for their lives, and the Centre Party was crushed.

Then Hitler turned to the German Nationalists and industrialists: to them he said, "You see, we are National Socialists, but we are really *national*. You are nationalists. We must work together." He invited Herr Hugenberg to remain in the Government, and Herr Hugenberg was sent to London in June 1933 to attend the International Economic Conference. He was encouraged to put forward a memorandum upon Germany's economic and political aims, showing that Germany needed to absorb territory to the east; as a matter of fact, to expand at the expense of Russia. The memorandum caused a great stir in London. It was at once disavowed in Berlin, and when Herr Hugenberg returned he found himself in disgrace. He has not been heard of since, and may be living in obscure retirement. So the process went on: Make friends with those whom

Ernst, and many others, and von Papen's secretary. Von Papen himself, the man who had helped Hitler to come into power, got timely warning or escaped by a miracle. Every man against whom Hitler had a special grudge disappeared that night or on the following day. The total named to me, and I think it is near the truth, was one thousand one hundred and eighty-three, Hitler admitted publicly that seventy-seven had been shot, and claimed that he had acted as "the supreme court of justice."

When the news of that massacre came to England there was a profound feeling of shock. A formidable leading article appeared in *The Times* of July 2, 1934. It was followed next day by a leader of a milder sort toning down the importance of the blood bath in Germany. On that bath of blood Hitler sailed his craft towards new horizons.

* * * * *

This was the new technique of aggressive "defence" in German internal affairs. A similar technique had already been adopted in 1931 by Japan in Manchuria. Germany was then still a member of the League of Nations. The question was: Should the Governments which formed the League and were supposed to desire peace and freedom stand against this Japanese aggression or not? There was no question of military intervention against Japan. There was a question that Great Britain, France, and the United States should say to

A New Technique of Conquest

the Japanese Government: "You have been a member of the League of Nations from its inception. You signed the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 by which you promised to protect China and her rights, with the United States, Great Britain, France, and six or seven other countries. You have ratified that treaty. You signed on August 27, 1928, with fourteen other states, the Kellogg-Briand Pact in renunciation of war. You ratified that treaty. What you are now doing is entirely incompatible with the engagements you have undertaken. You have grievances, no doubt. They may be legitimate. They shall be enquired into. But your methods are not compatible with the treaties you have signed and which we mean to uphold. Come now, do you wish to drive us into severing our commercial and financial relations with you, into taking action that might be inconvenient if not very harmful to you?" Such representations at that time would have encouraged and strengthened the Liberal Party in Japan, and the military clique would have been curbed or overthrown. We did not take that course. Under the guidance of that eminent lawyer who was then British Foreign Secretary, Sir John Simon, we declined even the invitation of the United States to make joint representations to Japan. And then the League ultimately appointed the Lytton Commission to enquire. Though the report of that commission was unanimously adopted by the assembly of the League, and a resolution of condemnation of Japan as aggressor was passed, the

New Tyrannies for Old

conquest of Manchuria went on. Its consequences are seen to-day in the burning of Hankow, Canton, and the indiscriminate massacre of hundreds of thousands of Chinese by bombing planes without a single voice of authorized protest being raised in this country or in France.

Note how the technique has gone on. Japan withdrew from the League after her special ambassador had paid the British Foreign Secretary the unsuspected, or at least the unexpected, compliment that he had put before the League Assembly in half an hour a better defence of Japan than the special ambassador himself had been able to make in ten days. A man of the forensic skill of Sir John Simon must have felt the cockles of his heart warmed by that compliment! I wonder what the Chinese thought of it, and of its recipient the British Foreign Secretary.

So Germany, seeing what was happening with Japan, decided in October 1934 on a flimsy pretext, though equality of rights had been granted her, to leave the League because the immediate equality of armaments was not granted. Germany left the League, as Hitler meant her to do. Here in England people seemed shocked. Why they should have been shocked I cannot imagine. Hitler had made his intentions quite plain in advance. He generally does. He trades, with rare psychological insight, upon the probability that foreign Governments will not believe him. German rearmament proceeded faster and faster. Some of us knew how

fast it had been proceeding. Some of us calculated that no less than £800,000,000 sterling a year were already being spent on German rearmament, and particularly on the German Air Force. Some of us communicated this information to the Government. But in that autumn of 1934 Mr. Stanley Baldwin, then Prime Minister, assured the House of Commons that we still had a considerable margin of strength over Germany in the air. In the following February that confident statement was repeated, with slight modifications, by official spokesmen. In the following April, Sir John Simon went to see Herr Hitler, the first of those pilgrimages which British statesmen have learned to make—pious pilgrimages. Sir John Simon was prepared to discuss with Herr Hitler the rationing of Germany, by international agreement, in aircraft and other armaments. When Herr Hitler, who can on occasion be perfectly truthful, and who has hidden his intentions far less than any other public figure that I know, said to Sir John Simon: "We are already much stronger than you are in the air" Sir John Simon thought he meant the Air Force of England. But no, he meant the combined air forces of the British Commonwealth. It was true. Sir John Simon came home and took another office. There was some talk of a ministry of supply and co-ordination to cope with Germany's rapidly growing Air Force. They were silenced; and voices began to be raised in the City of London and in the Press against any jealous envy of German armaments. The Germans had told us

New Tyrannies for Old

they needed a few token tanks, a few token guns; they did not mean to arm to threaten anybody. But poor Germany who had been so unjustly treated by the Treaty of Versailles had need of these things to maintain the nation's sense of dignity. Such arguments were put forward in the leading journals of the British Press in 1934 and 1935. Meanwhile, Germany went ahead and spent another £800,000,000 the next year, and still our official eyes were kept closed.

So in 1935 something else happened. There were signs of an intention on the part of the Italian dictator to attack and invade Abyssinia. In fact, an intimation to that effect had been given to the British Government in the previous January. A memorandum had been received and a commission had been appointed to examine it. The commission sat for some months, when it reported that it mattered little to us who might be our neighbours in North-East Africa. Meanwhile British ministers met Signor Mussolini at Stresa in April 1935, and most carefully avoided the subject!

Then, suddenly on September 11, 1935, Sir Samuel Hoare, who had succeeded Sir John Simon at the Foreign Office, made a speech at Geneva in which he said that the British policy was based upon the League and upon collective security. If other nations were willing to join us in applying the provisions of the League Covenant and Article XVI against any aggression, Great Britain would act. He spoke in a way that earned for him a moment of popularity such as few

British Foreign Secretaries have ever enjoyed. On the strength of that popularity, and of a certain peace ballot conducted by the League of Nations Union, the Government dissolved Parliament and held, on the strength of its devotion to collective security, a general election at which, in November 1935, it got its majority of two hundred seats which it holds to-day, and got it under false pretences. For before that election and while it was going on an official of the British Foreign Office was sitting in Paris, with the knowledge and approval of Sir Samuel Hoare, to work out what were afterwards called the Hoare-Laval proposals that meant the handing over to the aggressor, against whom we were organizing League sanctions, about two-thirds of his victim's territory in order that we might have peace. The sacred word: "Peace"! I must, however, say that at that moment thanksgiving services were not held by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

For a wave of indignation swept through the country at our betrayal of Abyssinia and the League, the wave that caused Mr. Baldwin to say: "When something like that hits me I know something is happening in the hearts of most of my fellow-countrymen and I begin to ask myself: Have I done wrong?" I do not think he need have asked himself. At any rate the Italian aggression went on. We faintly trusted the larger hope that the rains would come early and help Abyssinia to resist. They did not come in time. Italian mustard gas came quicker. Abyssinia was submerged, and the

question arose whether we should continue those sanctions against Italy to which we had pledged our word and our honour.

And then we heard the voice of the Chancellor, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, saying, "Continue sanctions? It would be the very midsummer of madness." I do not quite know what the phrase means. That is what he said. I have heard of "midsummer madness," but I do not know what the "midsummer of madness" may be, unless resistance to aggression is lunacy.

While the crushing of Abyssinia in 1936 was still proceeding, the new technique came into play again, not without previous consultation between Berlin and Rome—one of the earliest manifestations of the Rome-Berlin axis. That axis had, indeed, been projected, modelled, but somewhat upset in 1934 by an unexpected, perhaps ill-considered, exemplification of Herr Hitler's technique—the murder of Dr. Dollfuss, the Austrian Chancellor, by Austrian Nazis under orders from Berlin. (The murderers were executed. They have since been canonized as Nazi martyrs by Herr Hitler.) The independence of Austria seemed threatened; Signor Mussolini put some troops on the Austrian frontier; the Yugo-Slavs did the same, and Dr. von Schuschnigg could succeed the murdered Chancellor. But after the Abyssinian affair the Rome-Berlin axis grew stronger, and its strength was soon shown at the moment of the outbreak of a military revolt in Spain under General Franco, General Mola, and General Sanjurgo, who,

unfortunately for them, was killed in an aeroplane accident before he could take command. The outbreak of this revolt was helped at once by Italian aeroplanes flying from Italy to North Africa, though some of them, unluckily, had to land in French Morocco and were caught; the others helped General Franco to bring Moorish troops over to Spain in order to chastise the red and godless Spaniards. One cannot accuse the Moorish troops of being godless; they are Moslems in belief to a man; but, of course, it was their duty and privilege to uphold pure Christianity in Spain! And so the Spanish war began. We looked upon that outbreak with mixed feelings. People here could not understand why the British Government should deny to the lawful Spanish Government, duly elected and of which the ambassador was accredited to the Court of St. James, the right to buy war material and arms in the British market. To put an embargo on those purchases, as we did, was nothing less than a breach of international law committed in favour of insurgents and rebels.

With our indirect assistance the Spanish war continued. Italian "volunteers" appeared in Spain. German "volunteers" appeared in Spain. We looked the other way. It was supposed that the Spanish Government would soon be crushed. The fall of Madrid was announced for December 1936. Madrid has not yet fallen. But so powerful was the operation of the new technique of conquest, both in Spain and in Great Britain, that in February 1938 the Prime Minister, in

his desire to make an Anglo-Italian agreement to show his personal esteem for the good intentions and the peace-loving qualities of Signor Mussolini, discarded his Foreign Secretary, Mr. Anthony Eden, who said: "Before we make an agreement let us at least have some guarantee that it will be carried out." You understand the impiety of that request! It was casting doubt upon the good faith of Signor Mussolini. And so Mr. Eden went. He took with him the esteem of his fellow-countrymen—an esteem which was extended to the young nobleman who accompanied him, Lord Cranborne.

Before the surprise and doubt which that incident occasioned had passed away came news not only of Hitler's annexation of Austria, but of big concentrations of German troops on the borders of Czechoslovakia. Now please note how the technique was working in this country. My Lord Rothermere, who has consistently shown his admiration for Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini, and has seemed sometimes to be initiated into their secret ideas, began to publish articles demanding the suppression of the "nest of red intriguers" at Prague. So great a paper as the *Observer* wrote last spring that Czechoslovakia was formed like a sausage ready to be cut up—signs that showed how the wind was beginning to blow in certain regions.

Then rumours spread in the United States that a British Secretary of State had told, in confidence, certain American journalists (who had not betrayed his

confidence—they had not published what he said but they, confidentially, informed their editors) that Britain's real policy was to let Hitler eat his bellyful of Europe and only to stop him if he went beyond. Early in May there were also despatches from London in the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune* and in the *Montreal Star* that were evidently echoes of something heard in high quarters. It transpired later that though it was quite untrue that Lady Astor had given a dinner for the Prime Minister to meet these correspondents—quite untrue, there had only been a luncheon—these correspondents had been authorized to use what they might hear, coloured with their ideas, but, naturally, without stating the source. And the ideas they expressed foreshadowed in broad lines the policy that has since been followed. And I wonder whether the information that was sent by the ambassador of a Great Power to his Government last April on information which I understand that ambassador received from a personage closely connected with the Prime Minister, to the effect that Czechoslovakia would neither be helped nor supported by Great Britain, and perhaps not by France—I wonder whether that information was not accurate at that moment and whether it did not remain accurate ever afterwards?

If so, a question will arise as to what British technique is. For with what degree of sincerity can the Prime Minister have sent Lord Runciman to Prague at the beginning of August as an impartial investigator and

moderator if Mr. Chamberlain had already made up his mind in April? These are things we need to know, because they affect very considerably our judgment of the fitness of some men to uphold our national, vital interest in our own freedom and independence.

And then the technique went forward. Think over this question: Did you know a year ago that there existed in Europe people called Sudeten Germans? Will anyone remember them two years hence? I doubt it. They have dawned upon us through the mists of German propaganda, they and their grievances, their "intolerable grievances"! Though they have had more schools per head of population than the Czechs themselves, there were undoubtedly causes of friction. A people numbering 7,000,000 cannot be put on top in their own country, after having been subjected to a minority for three hundred years and oppressed by that minority, and expected to immediately forget the oppression. Undoubtedly, there were many instances of harshness and petty annoyance on the part of Czech officials towards the Sudeten Germans; but it is certain that if the Poles in Germany or the Germans in the Southern Tyrol of Italy or any minorities under Hungary, and some under Rumania, could have exchanged places with the Sudeten Germans they would have thought themselves in Paradise. It was against the "intolerable treatment" of these people that our indignation was aroused by the new technique.

Yet, in between, was one curious episode. On the

night of May 20, 1938, when German troops were concentrated against two sides of the Czechoslovak border, and so openly concentrated that the British Government began to make enquiries what these concentrations might mean, the Czechoslovak General Staff asked President Beneš to authorize a general mobilization to which he replied: "No! no general mobilization; it would alarm Europe; only enough men to make sure that an attack by surprise cannot succeed." On that night at 8.30 orders went out to one class of the reservists of the Czechoslovak Army, 90,000 men, to join their posts within twelve hours; that is to say, by 10 a.m. on May 21st. At the same time, the specialists, the airmen, the tank drivers, machine-gunners and so on of all the other classes were mobilized, another 84,000 men, who were given twenty-four hours to join their posts. By 3 a.m. on the morning of May 21, 70 per cent of the first 90,000 were in their places; by 10 a.m.—all. The 84,000, who had twenty-four hours, all joined up within twelve hours; and of the 174,000 thus mobilized only eight did not turn up. And on the morning of May 21st, even at dawn, the Germans across the frontier knew that a surprise attack could not succeed. But on that day—and it is a point that should be of interest to us—the British ambassador in Berlin enquired of Herr von Ribbentrop, German Foreign Secretary, what these concentrations of troops might mean and he was given a very curt reply: "They are merely routine movements." Report says that the

Lord Rothermere. It said one or two things which may strike you as not untrue even to-day. There are one or two passages it may be worth while reading. I said: "Why you should wish to weaken the defence of this country by encouraging Germany to attack and, if possible, obliterate Czecho-Slovakia is a mystery to me. I can readily understand why Germany should wish to do this. Czecho-Slovakia juts out into the heart of Germany. Her existence as an armed state inhabited by a determined and efficient people impedes German domination over Central and South-Eastern Europe. This domination in its turn is an indispensable preliminary to a final German reckoning with the British Empire which forms the ultimate obstacle to German supremacy in the world." And then, finally, I said: "For this country and the Empire the position is clear. Either we stand with France and for France against German domination of Europe while there is still time to avoid that domination, and while we still have friends, or we shall presently be confronted with a choice between abject surrender to German mastery over the greater part of Europe or a desperate, friendless fight for existence in which the odds would be heavily against us. So I urge you to bethink yourself to learn the truth and to proclaim it. This is your duty as a newspaper owner and as a British peer." I am not ashamed of having written that letter on July 18th.

We know the sequel. Lord Runciman was sent to Prague to investigate and mediate. He did, perhaps,

some investigation and some mediation. His pressure was all on one side. As he himself said later: "All the concessions have been made by the Czechs; none by the Sudeten Germans." In his memorandum published in the White Paper—a memorandum written after his return to London and after conversations with members of the Government—he said that the Fourth Plan produced by the Czechio-Slovak Government was hopeful and would have afforded, in his view, a basis for a settlement. But precisely on account of its reasonableness and satisfactory character it had no chance of being accepted by the Henlein extremists. Therefore, added Lord Runciman, "It is my view that the Sudeten German region should be handed over to Germany." That is the reasoning of an impartial investigator and mediator in the presence of proposals which he himself had helped to frame, of which the terms had been granted, under severe pressure, by the Czechio-Slovak Government, perhaps against its better judgment but for the sake of peace; and then, because they were unpalatable to the Nazi extremists, the whole of Czechio-Slovakia must be cut up! Surely the new technique of conquest had made astounding strides.

And so there came the last, swift sequel to this remarkable behaviour. One cannot tell it better than in some of the words of the Prime Minister to the House of Commons. He made up his mind, after Herr Hitler had delivered a somewhat truculent speech at Nuremberg, to go over to see Herr Hitler himself. He

Lord Rothermere. It said one or two things which may strike you as not untrue even to-day. There are one or two passages it may be worth while reading. I said: "Why you should wish to weaken the defence of this country by encouraging Germany to attack and, if possible, obliterate Czecho-Slovakia is a mystery to me. I can readily understand why Germany should wish to do this. Czecho-Slovakia juts out into the heart of Germany. Her existence as an armed state inhabited by a determined and efficient people impedes German domination over Central and South-Eastern Europe. This domination in its turn is an indispensable preliminary to a final German reckoning with the British Empire which forms the ultimate obstacle to German supremacy in the world." And then, finally, I said: "For this country and the Empire the position is clear. Either we stand with France and for France against German domination of Europe while there is still time to avoid that domination, and while we still have friends, or we shall presently be confronted with a choice between abject surrender to German mastery over the greater part of Europe or a desperate, friendless fight for existence in which the odds would be heavily against us. So I urge you to bethink yourself to learn the truth and to proclaim it. This is your duty as a newspaper owner and as a British peer." I am not ashamed of having written that letter on July 18th.

We know the sequel. Lord Runciman was sent to Prague to investigate and mediate. He did, perhaps,

some investigation and some mediation. His pressure was all on one side. As he himself said later: "All the concessions have been made by the Czechs; none by the Sudeten Germans." In his memorandum published in the White Paper—a memorandum written after his return to London and after conversations with members of the Government—he said that the Fourth Plan produced by the Czecho-Slovak Government was hopeful and would have afforded, in his view, a basis for a settlement. But precisely on account of its reasonableness and satisfactory character it had no chance of being accepted by the Henlein extremists. Therefore, added Lord Runciman, "It is my view that the Sudeten German region should be handed over to Germany." That is the reasoning of an impartial investigator and mediator in the presence of proposals which he himself had helped to frame, of which the terms had been granted, under severe pressure, by the Czecho-Slovak Government, perhaps against its better judgment but for the sake of peace; and then, because they were unpalatable to the Nazi extremists, the whole of Czecho-Slovakia must be cut up! Surely the new technique of conquest had made astounding strides.

And so there came the last, swift sequel to this remarkable behaviour. One cannot tell it better than in some of the words of the Prime Minister to the House of Commons. He made up his mind, after Herr Hitler had delivered a somewhat truculent speech at Nuremberg, to go over to see Herr Hitler himself. He

ambassador retorted, "You told me that before you went into Austria." And then there were words between him and Herr von Ribbentrop. The British ambassador reported the conversation and was instructed to see Herr von Ribbentrop again that afternoon. And once more Herr von Ribbentrop was anything but courteous, some say he was positively rude; at any rate, the ambassador was so impressed that he informed the Czecho-Slovak minister in Berlin that evening of his belief that the Germans might attack Czecho-Slovakia during the night. He reported to London. At ten o'clock that night instructions were sent to him to go again to Herr von Ribbentrop and tell Germany she must not count upon British indifference; to remind him of what the Prime Minister said in the House of Commons on March 24th—that our indifference must not be assumed. That message was delivered towards midnight, and on the Monday morning the withdrawal of the German troops began. Great Britain became popular in Germany where it was felt that our firmness had checked Hitler. I wonder how that peculiar hiatus in the consistency of British policy happened to occur. I do not know. I am told that when the immediate danger was over something like an explanation, a friendly explanation, was sent from London to Berlin: We really did not mean it. But of that I have no positive information. It is only a rumour.

In June things began to warm up in earnest. Germany was seething with discontent against Hitler and his

A New Technique of Conquest

regime. Germany was on the verge of severe economic trouble. The German Army was highly discontented with a policy that seemed to be leading to war before the German Army was fully ready for it. Herr Hitler, Dr. Goebbels, and the others intensified their propaganda, with the peculiar technique of which they had the secret, and there was in the *Daily Mail* of July 18th another article by Lord Rothermere of which I will quote you one paragraph: The title is "How long shall the Czechs imperil peace?" He said: "Of all the blunders made by the men who made the peace the creation of Czechoslovakia was the worst." The article concluded: "The Czechs had a military alliance with France, and in 1935 made a military alliance with Soviet Russia. By doing this the Czechs prepared their doom. The Bolsheviks are the natural foes of Nazi Germany. Now that the German jaws are closing upon Czechoslovakia, the Czechs in their alarm have begun to make reforms. For many weeks past their Government has professed to be preparing a new statute for redressing the grievances of the minorities. This is manifestly no more than a device for gaining time." (The very words of Herr Hitler a few weeks later.) "The Czech Government hope some unforeseen turn in the international situation may provide an escape from the penalties of its past misdeeds. Meanwhile business in Britain and Europe is being kept under the cloud of grave war danger." Do not forget that—"business in Britain." When I read this article I wrote a tender missive to

said this was no improvisation, he had long cherished this idea, but this was the moment to carry it out. He went over and saw Herr Hitler, who told him that he was ready to start a world war unless he could get what he wanted. When the Prime Minister said: "Then I am wasting my time?" Herr Hitler replied, "Do You accept the principle of self-determination?" The Prime Minister said he could not answer that at once; he would return and consult his colleagues. So he consulted his colleagues and they decided they did. But they forgot something very important, and had they known a little more they could have given a better answer to Herr Hitler. They could have reminded him that President Woodrow Wilson who first put the idea of self-determination forward, linked it indissolubly with the formation of an association of nations to banish aggression by making collective security a reality, and that self-determination was only one-half of his principles. The British Government never told Herr Hitler that. They sent for the French, and with the French they decided to cut up Czecho-Slovakia, and to hand over these regions. Having done that on the night of September 18th, they telegraphed their decision urgently to Prague and said Prague must accept. Prague pointed out that the proposals were vague and that some of them could not be carried out and asked whether there should not be arbitration and enquiry in accordance with their arbitration treaty with Germany the validity of which the Germans had

A New Technique of Conquest

only recently fully recognized. And then, according to the telegram that was divulged in the course of the debate in Parliament at the beginning of October, the British, and probably also the French, Government sent Prague one of the most remarkable diplomatic documents I ever remember reading. It said, in effect, to the British minister in Prague: "You must at once inform the Czecho-Slovak Government that there can be no talk of arbitration. It would not be possible. The Prime Minister must give his answer to Herr Hitler on Wednesday—this was sent in the small hours of Tuesday, at 2 a.m.—therefore there must be unconditional acceptance or Great Britain will decline all responsibility for the consequences. (As much as to say: Look out for yourselves; we are not going to help you.) Carry out these instructions with your French colleagues at whatever hour. It was 2 a.m. when they hauled President Beneš out of bed, and then, under this extreme pressure, the Czechs gave way. I personally thought then, think now, and thought before, that they did wrong to yield. But one must put oneself in their place before one can judge.

Something very remarkable then happened. The Prime Minister, glad at last to have the means of showing Herr Hitler that we accepted "self-determination," that his technique had been successful up to that point, flew over to Godersberg. He explained what took place to the House of Commons on September 28th; and it is well to bear his account in mind because you

will not often hear such language, I hope, from the lips of a British Prime Minister. He said he expounded at Godesberg the Anglo-French plan to Herr Hitler who accepted conditionally some of the points in the plan but refused others as too dilatory. Herr Hitler then outlined another proposal, which he subsequently embodied in a memorandum, though he did not at that moment transform it into an ultimatum by naming a time-limit for its acceptance. "Honourable members," the Prime Minister went on, "will realize the perplexity in which I found myself, faced with this totally unexpected situation." (Why "unexpected"? The German wireless had for some days been demanding the complete suppression and dismemberment of Czechoslovakia; and the German wireless, as we know, is not an entirely free and irresponsible institution.) The Prime Minister continued: "I had been told at Berchtesgaden that if the principle of self-determination were accepted, Herr Hitler would discuss with me the ways and means of carrying it out. He told me afterwards that he had never for one moment supposed I should be able to come back and say the principle was accepted. I do not want honourable members to think that he was deliberately deceiving me. I do not think so for one moment, but I expected that when I got back to Godesberg I had only to discuss quietly with him the proposals that I had brought with me, and it was a profound shock to me when I was told at the beginning of the conversation that these proposals were not

acceptable and that they were to be replaced by other proposals of a kind which I had not contemplated at all." You may remember Mr. Winston Churchill's description of that particular episode: Instead of snatching his victuals from the table Herr Hitler had them served to him, course by course. He demanded £1 at the pistol point. It was given him. Then he demanded £2, and finally consented to accept £1 17s. 6d. with the rest in promises of good behaviour—and then he went on to take more than £2.

This technique has been quite remarkably—and, as I think, lamentably—successful. If you follow the British Press and the French Press during the whole of the period of the crisis you will see how perfectly the technique has worked. There were murmurings, there were certain protests, but Parliament was not summoned. Parliament was kept in the background, despite requests, until the thing was almost settled; and fear was worked up that we might at a moment's notice be attacked, be affronted, be plunged into war. Whether the fear was baseless or not, who can say? I am quite persuaded, knowing something of the situation, that if Great Britain had stood firm on the position taken on May 21, 1938, in the communications handed by the British ambassador to the German Government, there would not only have been no war; there would have been no danger of war and the Czechoslovak Republic would to-day be intact.

Do I say that because of the strength of our arma-

compelled them to take in compensation things they do not want. Yugoslavia has been compelled, in order to get something from Germany, to take ten years' supply of aspirin; Greece compelled to take a whole lot of practically worthless gas-masks for the army, not those of the latest model, but the 1934 model; Turkey compelled to take other things for her raisins. One Greek firm, in despair of getting anything for the tobacco it had supplied to Germany, was compelled to take several hundred thousand German mouth-organs, and took them in the belief that there would be a ready market for them in the United States. They were sent to the United States where it was found that the market had already been swamped with mouth-organs direct from Germany! These are facts. And this technique has been pushed forward to quite incredible lengths. The last instalment of it is the journey made by the gentleman with the admirable name of Dr. Funk who went on an economic journey, or journey of economic research and co-ordination, to the Balkans the moment Great Britain and France had capitulated to Herr Hitler.

How can we stand against this new technique after we have made a present to Germany of the three million men she would have needed to overthrow Czecho-Slovakia—and even then her success would have been doubtful—of the two thousand aeroplanes she would have needed to bomb Czecho-Slovak defences; of all the armaments works of Czecho-

Slovakia which will pretty nearly double Germany's power of making armaments rapidly? And in the name of what principle can we stand when we have sacrificed principle? I can see only one way: that against this new technique of conquest we should revert to our old technique of defence, which is to have a principle and to stand by it and for it; to have an ideal that goes beyond mere material interests or the cry that if we are steadfast it will be bad for business.

We had the Great War. After that we thought a new technique of peace had been developed. We thought that the ideal embodied in the League Covenant meant the opening of a warless era in the history of the world. We were not very valiant in striving for the fulfilment of that ideal, but it has gone very deep into our people's hearts. If you destroy it and abandon it totally; if you ask our people to go back to mere power-politics, to fight for the defence of Malta, Gibraltar, or some other bit of territory, you will get your response, but it will not be the response you would have got if you had said: If fight we must we will fight to uphold a better civilization for your children, to hold the name of England high as one of the leaders in the preservation of the freedom of the world!

We have had in the past moments of danger perhaps that seemed to be as acute as this moment. Without going back to Saxon times we can look at the times of Charles II. And then, little by little, our virtue returned. By the beginning of the eighteenth century we were

A New Technique of Conquest

sending out into the world great doctrines, great truths, like those of John Locke, the apostle of the principle of toleration, the principle of freedom of the human mind and human intellect. From those ideas grew the encyclopaedist movement in France that produced not only the French Revolution of 1879 but the American Declaration of Independence; and on these ideas and with these ideals as object and goal we have gone forward throughout the nineteenth century up to the Great War. After the Great War we accepted the new ideal of collective security against war itself. Are we going to spurn these ideals completely? Or are we going to say to all whom it may concern: If you want this people to stand against the new technique of conquest, drawn from hell, give it something to believe in, rekindle its faith? Do not allow its faith to vanish; show it that you believe in something above mere material interest; ask it to stand, aye, and to die if necessary, for something worth while, and you will get such a response as will not only astonish you but put new courage into the hearts of millions untold throughout the world. And ultimately you will present an invincible front to the users of the new technique, and vanquish their infernal tyranny over the human soul.

DANGER SPOTS IN EUROPE

Major-General A. C. Temperley

WHEN I was asked in July 1938 to prepare an outline of my proposed paper, I ventured to point out that, in these hectic days, events moved so fast that a suitable outline prepared in July might well have become waste paper in November. On re-reading it, however, when I began to prepare the paper, I really felt that in spite of the lapse of time since the outline was written it is still not entirely irrelevant to the subject of my address on "The Danger Spots in Europe."

We have recently stood on the edge of the abyss, and I should like to say, at the beginning, that, concerning the Czechoslovak situation, which is uppermost in all our minds, I desire to avoid, as far as I can, discussing the rights or wrongs of the recent political settlement. I myself owe allegiance to no political party and I perfectly understand that readers may be deeply divided as to the way in which it has been handled, and it is the future rather than the past with which we are now concerned.

So far as danger spots are concerned, it is the merest truism to say that they are linked in every case with the ambitions of the totalitarian states. I think it is perhaps

very difficult for us to realize the attitude of the "have-not" group of states, replete as we are with spoil ourselves. We are inclined to think "Why can't they let things alone? Why should they want more territory or the readjustment of frontiers?" Our period of expansion, or imperialism, if you like, ceased in 1902, and the taking over of the mandates for German colonies was chiefly confined to the Dominions who feared Germany as close neighbours.

Having got all we wanted many years ago, let us try and look at the picture from the "have-not" point of view. Just as Germany struggles to undo what she conceives to be the injustice of the Versailles Treaty so Signor Mussolini, who believes in the glittering prizes which come to sharp swords and stout hearts, dreams his dreams of a great African empire. An Italian officer I knew well said to me shortly after the Great War, "We have the psychology of a beaten nation. We went into the War and have got practically nothing from the Peace Treaties; even the London Agreement, the price of our coming into the War, was not kept." You must not jump to the conclusion that I condone Nazi methods or I wear a black or a brown shirt under my waistcoat, but I do suggest when these vigorous and aggressive states begin to feel their military strength we ought not to be so surprised when they want to gather some of the fruits. There is one further matter that we should do well to reflect upon. It has been the almost universal experience of recent history that political and territorial

claims are rarely recognized, merely because of their intrinsic justice. Ireland, Vilna, India, and Palestine are all instances of the deplorable fact that nothing is ever likely to be won in this wicked world as it now is except by violence or at any rate the threat of it.

The League of Nations, perhaps the one hope that emerged from the shambles of the last war, sought to substitute justice and conciliation for force, and no Great Power can entirely escape blame for using it for its own ends or for failing to give it adequate support. We are faced with a League that is plainly dying, though it may in happier times rise again. What a mockery that the Czecho-Slovak situation was not even on its agenda for discussion! We are, for the time being, back to the law of the jungle, as it was in 1914, when force and not right are likely to prevail. But I must not cry over spilt milk, and I will face up to the situation as it seems to me to-day.

If the danger spots are dominated by the Berlin-Rome axis, let us consider how long the axis is likely to continue. When the Nazis came into power they were isolated. Their only possible friend in Europe was Fascist Italy. But the gulf between them was Mussolini's fear of Germany at the Brenner; there followed in quick succession the murder of Dollfuss and the abortive revolution. Then came the Stresa front, by which Mussolini hoped to isolate the Nazis—a promising conception destroyed by aggression against Abyssinia.

The two outcasts steadily increased their military

strength, and after some approaches to each other, reached an informal alliance in the summer of 1937. I attended the German manœuvres as a guest, and was present during Mussolini's stay in Berlin. I think I can fairly say that it aroused no enthusiasm among the German people, much less so among the army, who could not forget Italy's desertion of them in 1915, nor had they any great respect for her fighting qualities. There was the bond of intervention in Spain, though one might almost have believed that Germany's chief interest in the war in Spain was to obtain iron ore and to test her new war material, which had been made in secret and was therefore likely to develop many defects. It proved to be only too true. Mussolini had a far greater stake to play for as he was anxious to eliminate some of the disadvantages of his Mediterranean position, which I shall discuss later. Thus once again perceived the divergence of aim of the two dictators.

Then came the thunderclap of Hitler's ultimatum to Schuschnigg, to be followed by the peaceful occupation of Austria by the German army. Schuschnigg, in his hour of need, appealed to his protector, who had several times declared his determination to safeguard Austrian independence, but the oracle remained dumb. I can imagine that the Duce passed through the bitterest hours of his life when the union with Austria was forcibly obtained. He saw the complete defeat of the *bloc* he had erected to stay the march of Germany to the East, as well as his own public humiliation before

his people, having failed to make good his boasts or to protect his protégé. And this was administered by the hand of his so-called friend. It was not all. He was compelled, as in the case of Czechoslovakia, to support an appeal to the principle of self-determination when he himself had a discontented and repressed German minority of a quarter of a million in the Southern Tyrol, separated from their German-Austrian kin by nothing more than a line on a map. His people were shocked and his own prestige was lowered. What a mockery to him the splendour of Hitler's reception in Rome must have been.

Italians are subtle diplomatists, far more so than the Nazis now installed in the Wilhelmstrasse, and they have long memories. I think that they will not forget and will one day repay the wound to their pride and to their strategic security inflicted upon them by the overrunning of Austria.

So far as German aims are concerned, I believe that their limited ones are national unity. Other and vaster schemes may await the acquirement of the more limited ones, of which Austria and the Sudeten areas are both conspicuous examples. Although the Führer has in each case, including the reoccupation of the demilitarized zone, announced that he desires no more territorial adjustments in Europe, I wonder whether his appetite is satisfied and the next danger spots are likely to be where a preponderance of people of German blood exist in the vicinity of the present German

Danger Spots in Europe

frontiers. If we accept the principle of self-determination, which in the case of the peace treaties was conceded to almost everybody except the defeated states, one could hardly refuse temperate negotiations where injustices seem to exist. What English people so unanimously condemn is the threat of overwhelming force as a means of redressing an alleged wrong, which has always been Hitler's method.

A few years ago Germany had been worked up by propaganda to a state of great excitement about the Polish Corridor, which seemed then to be the first step that Herr Hitler was going to take towards "winning the peace." Suddenly, without any previous warning, a non-aggression pact for ten years was signed with Poland. I do not think that Germany, strong as she is, would welcome war with Poland over the Corridor, which is now, as a matter of fact, about 90 per cent Polish. But I do not doubt that Germany will try and negotiate for some return of territory, particularly in Silesia, and certainly a corridor through the Corridor to give her direct access to East Prussia. There are also the cities of Danzig, nominally under the League of Nations, but completely in the hands of the Nazis, and Memel, which has mainly a German population in the city itself but was seized by Lithuania some years ago. Poland might be induced to give up her rights in Danzig, important though it is to her at the mouth of the Vistula, for some financial consideration, and Lithuania might surrender Memel if sufficient pressure

were applied to her. One may expect to see these areas as a possible limited aim of German policy, but, though no one can prophesy with safety what Hitler will do in any given situation, I should hardly have thought that he would appeal to force for such a settlement.

I have just mentioned Poland ; I regard her attitude as almost the key to the future of Eastern Europe. She has treaties of non-aggression with both her big neighbours and will undoubtedly fight if either tried to march through Poland to attack the other. Her foreign policy is not easy to understand ; she has had a treaty of alliance with France and has received large loans from her ; it was a tragedy that her greedy desire to absorb Teschen and share in the spoil when Czechoslovakia was in difficulties completely obscured all other issues and caused her to work hand and glove with Germany on that occasion. She has a large and efficient army trained on Western lines and would probably put forty-five divisions into the field. It could become of decisive importance to Germany if she were engaged elsewhere.

Last of all among German limited aims, if we exclude Alsace and Lorraine, which she seems really to have renounced, there are Eupen and Malmedy, now incorporated into Belgium, and Schleswig, which is now Denmark, but it may be doubted whether Hitler would think these worth bothering about.

Having expressed my view as to what I believe to be

Danger Spots in Europe

Hitler's limited aims—that of national unity—which may well provoke danger spots, I turn for a few moments to his ultimate aims.

It may, I think, be inferred from the enormous fortified lines that he is constructing in the West, that he means to stand on the defensive on that flank and the moves he is going to make are towards the East. One wonders what his objectives are going to be. Trieste? The Black Sea? Salonika? Any of these would give him an outlet on the Mediterranean.

His weaknesses are lack of food, of oil, of rubber, of copper, iron ore, and other metals. Hungary and the Ukraine could give him corn, Roumania could give him oil, though insufficient, I believe, to meet all his needs for waging a war of any length. The Germans are pursuing a very active commercial policy in the Balkans and in Turkey. To all these states nothing impresses so much as a military prestige, and I dare say that Germany will succeed in improving her trade and even gaining some political adherents. She can exchange armaments and machinery for agricultural products and raw material. She has always traded largely with these countries: with Yugoslavia, for instance, she already takes 42 per cent of their export trade. Her ultimate aim no doubt is not so much conquest as trade agreements and eventual absorption into a big commercial-political *bloc*. Here again German and Italian interests clash.

It is said that one of the reasons that induced

Mussolini to give no support to the Czechs was that he thought them too exposed and too encircled already to be of any use in holding up the German march eastward. For that reason, in spite of German opposition, he has strongly supported the Hungarian territorial claims upon Slovakia, in order that they might join hands with Poland and so form a more stable barrier against German progress down the Danube. This has been Poland's aim too, that of establishing a *bloc* from Finland to Greece, but I don't think its military value would be great.

I have not yet mentioned the one possible factor in the struggle, the U.S.S.R. To me I must confess that she is an enigma. Her military strength is great. Her peace-time army numbers at least 1,300,000 men, and this is backed by very adequate material based on great industrial power, the product of two five-year plans. She is reputed to have at least 3,000 tanks and probably 5,000-6,000 aeroplanes. Those who have visited the manœuvres of the Red Army have been impressed by its efficiency, though the officers are perhaps the weak spot. Her pilots and aeroplanes are first class, and performed extremely well in Spain. Her railways are, of course, poor and the rolling stock very indifferent. For that reason she probably is incapable of an offensive on a large scale. The great query in the case of the army is the extent to which its value has declined as the result of the extensive "purges" of officers from the high command downwards. One always has an uneasy

Danger Spots in Europe

feeling that the Red Army, from sheer inefficiency, will not be there when it is wanted. An army of 300,000 was concentrated on the Polish frontier when the Poles were threatening Czecho-Slovakia, but nothing more was heard of it. Direct support to Czecho-Slovakia was only possible via one line of railway through Roumania, and this would have been practically useless.

The Red Air Force, on the contrary, might have done great things from Czecho-Slovakia, and the Germans obviously feared it. But a large ground organization was necessary as well as spare parts and petrol and these had to be sent in advance. I have not been able to discover that it had been done. Moreover, however gallantly the Czechs had fought, few who have really studied the question and the scale of German attack thought they could have held out for more than a month. The aerodromes would gradually have been overrun, and when this happened, the possibility of anything effective being done by the Red Air Force disappeared.

Direct assistance to the Czechs by any country was extraordinarily difficult, but the menace of the U.S.S.R. to future penetration by the Germans remains. She could give great help to the Roumanians, and I do not think the Germans would lightly undertake an invasion of the Ukraine, unless the Soviet armed forces had deteriorated very greatly. It would also bring her into conflict with Poland who has a large Ruthenian minority.

The Czech situation is no longer, strictly speaking, a danger spot. All the signs are that what is left of Bohemia will be politically and economically absorbed into the German orbit.

Czecho-Slovakia had an army of twelve divisions, and might on mobilization have raised at least another twelve. If war had come Germany would have attacked with thirty or more divisions and overwhelming air forces.

France would have taken the offensive to take the weight off Czecho-Slovakia, but she would have been faced with the Siegfried Line which has been constructed with such feverish haste by the Germans to protect their back door, and it is doubtful whether the French penetration could have been very deep. In any case so soon as the Czechs were disposed of, the greater part of the German divisions employed there could have been withdrawn to face the French offensive.

Our Air Force would undoubtedly have done its best to help the French, but it is probable that the German Air Force is at least equal to the French and British combined. She would be handicapped, of course, in the early stages by employing a large part of it against the Czechs. Meanwhile, the British Fleet could have imposed an effective blockade. The question then would arise as to how soon this would have brought about a German collapse. There would be, so far as I can see, no other means of ending the war, during which we should be unmercifully bombed, our cities

Danger Spots in Europe

wrecked, and tremendous casualties would be suffered without the possibility of retaliation on anything like the same scale.

I have seen a wealth of statistics compiled from official German sources to show that owing to her lack of petrol she could not stand a long war. Her manufacture of petrol from coal, a very expensive process, would only produce about 2,800,000 tons per annum, whereas her needs in one year of war would be as much as 16,000,000. These facts are, of course, perfectly well known to the German General Staff, and even if they have stored a very large quantity one would have thought that a very rapid decision was essential. It is a nice calculation as to whether the blockade or the bombing would win.

In the future, if it should come to a trial of strength between Germany and an Anglo-French alliance, the difficulties of the latter will be very much greater. We shall have lost the Czech Army and probably the Russian Army, while thirty to forty additional German divisions will now be available on the Western Front from the very beginning. The German population will also be increased by 3,000,000, making her whole population practically equal to England and France combined.

We have now fully considered the position in Central Europe, bearing in mind my thesis of the divergent aims of Italy and Germany. Let us turn to the Mediterranean and the Italian position there. Their strategical position

is very weak, hence her anxiety to make an agreement with us. She has a lengthy and exposed coastline, and it is well to remember that she is almost entirely dependent upon her sea-borne trade. If Germany were blockaded she would certainly have nothing to spare to pass on to Italy by land, and it is in the highest degree unlikely that Italy could obtain any supplies from Yugoslavia, her neighbour. Her sea-borne trade mainly comes through Gibraltar and the Suez Canal, both of which we dominate.

The only other sea approach is via the Black Sea and the Dardanelles. The attitude of Turkey, Roumania, and Russia would be enormously important. Turkey could, if she so desired, close the Dardanelles, and she is fortunately at present on very friendly terms with us. Even if the Dardanelles were open we could probably deal with any merchant shipping coming from Roumania and Russia, not that it is likely that Russia could be induced to give material support to a Fascist State.

The greater part of Italian oil supplies come from Roumania, and the intentions of Roumania would be, of course, very important. Italy is very far from being self-sufficient. She lacks food, she has no iron ore, rubber, textiles, or most of the essential raw materials for munitions, and, most vital of all, is the question of oil. Germany is extremely badly off and has none to spare for Italy. Her position in the Eastern Mediterranean is bad, for the more she gives her hostages to fortune overseas in Libya and Abyssinia the more

Danger Spots in Europe

easily our command of the sea can sever communications. Egypt is the strategical key and an attack over 250 miles of waterless desert from Libya is not an inviting prospect.

Let us look at the Western Mediterranean and Spain where our situation is a good deal less favourable.

I need not go into the whole history of the operations in Spain, but to put it in a sentence—a weak and independent Spain would suit us best from a political and strategical point of view.

The fortunes of the Spanish Civil War have ebbed and flowed and once more it is beginning to look something like a stalemate owing to the extraordinary tenacity of the Government troops in the Ebro offensive. The gloomiest result from our point of view would be a victorious Franco completely under the thumb of Italian-German interests with the possibility of the establishment of Italian submarine and air bases along the south-eastern coast of Spain and the continued occupation by Italy of the Balearic Islands. I personally am not convinced that the Spaniards, who are a proud people, would ever submit to this sort of thing, and Mussolini has given no less than three formal and solemn undertakings, for what they are worth, that he has no intention of occupying any part of Spanish soil, including the Balearic Isles.

As regards bases on the Spanish coast, it must be remembered that the objects of bases are to give supplies, fuel, facilities for repair, and also shelter for

naval and air forces. If one has neither the command of the sea nor a free approach to the bases by land on one's own territory their usefulness is not great. It is true that in any case they could be supplied by air, but certainly not in quantities big enough to serve the proper purpose of a base.

For all these reasons, including the presence of the British Mediterranean Fleet as well as the large French Fleet, I do not believe that the Italian position is a strong one, though her air forces would probably close it as a route for supply ships. Until the situation has been cleared up, however, Spain will remain perhaps the greatest danger spot in Europe, outside the German drive to the East, and the most menacing to our interests.

The phraseology of the subject of my chapter is perhaps out of date, as all Europe is a danger spot. I do not believe that totalitarian regimes can be permanent; they are a phase in world evolution, born of defeat in war and lack of the determination or vision on our part to alleviate the inevitable injustices of the peace treaties when we could. Nor even do I think that a move by Germany to the East, with a view to creating a great hegemony of small states, will be a path strewn with roses, and, in particular, I have laid emphasis on the doubts in my mind as to whether the axis can endure when the aims of its two components differ so much.

Other states in the past have dominated the Continent; Louis XIV, Napoleon, Germany after 1870, and

Danger Spots in Europe

France after 1918. We have always instinctively opposed a dominant Power which is a potential enemy, in other words we have supported the balance of power. It is at present a much distorted balance.

Our policy, with rare exceptions, has been not to allow our disapproval of systems of government to interfere with collaboration with them. Our choice to-day seems to be between trying to establish some means of living with totalitarian Governments, on the understanding of no future aggressions, or of fighting them. However unpromising the first may be, and each of us in our hearts is no doubt constantly weighing its possibilities, there is but one stark alternative left. And that is to pile up armaments on an enormous scale and to prepare for the inevitable.

THE CONFUSION OF WESTERN DEMOCRACY

UNDER CAPITALIST DOMINATION

Geneviève Tabouis

It is a great honour and a great joy for each one of us individually to belong to a great democratic nation. In spite of obvious imperfections, a certain equality presides over our destinies; we may express ourselves freely, live as we please, eat and dress as we please, criticize our Government when we think it necessary, and our political friends rather more than our political adversaries. In brief, we live in a nation where a human being may live profitably, interestingly, and with dignity.

In the way of life imposed by the dictators, everyone must think alike, write only what he is compelled to write, hear over the radio only what his Government permits him to hear, have only one dish at a meal, and that the same one the other eighty-five million citizens are having. He is restricted to one ideal, must love and serve a single leader, can have only one occupation, and must submit to innumerable manual and intellectual exercises, imposed by his ruler, or else die in prison.

It is with these indisputable facts in mind, and in face

The Confusion of Western Democracy

of this new conception of human life which Hitler and Mussolini wish to impose universally, that I have no courage, nor do I recognize it as my right, to criticize the democracies.

However, it is impossible, in the course of our everyday lives since the Munich accord, not to be severely critical of our respective Governments.

These Governments were in possession of all the powers necessary, not only to come out victoriously, without a war, in the last crisis, but also to compel the autocracies to "eat crow," if not worse, and for many years to come. Given the unstable balance in which Hitler and Mussolini exist, who could say that it might not have been the beginning of the end for them?

Naturally, I cannot here attempt to criticize our two capitalistic regimes from a technical point of view. I would not dare to do so, and moreover, I could not do so. But I am going to put forward quite modestly some observations which my profession led me to make in the course of the September crisis, on the failure of the capitalistic system, at least of the French system, from the point of view of foreign policy.

We must first recognize honestly that these Governments (for example, the present French Government) have real power in their hands to act in the difficulties which presently confront them in respect to public opinion, liberty of the Press, and industry. If the democratic governments acted as they did in the September crisis, it was, especially in the case of France,

by no means because they were forced to it as interpreters of the free exercise of individual liberties culminating in a single will of the people. Because, as we have just said, they had in their hands all the imaginable power to act.

It is clear that in France in the course of this last year, while Hitler and Mussolini each morning provided the world with astounding news in every domain, whatever French Government happened to be in power has more or less occupied itself principally with grabbing as much power as possible over all the nation's activities. The pretext has been that in order to meet Hitler's projected mass movements, it was indispensable that the French Government also should be able to act as it believed fitting in important questions.

That sacred speech, repeated by how many ministers of foreign affairs: "You understand, gentlemen, that if you continue to express yourselves freely in print in criticism of me, in accordance with your diverse opinions, you place our nation at a disadvantage in international negotiations, since the German and Italian Press is always unanimously in agreement with the foreign policy of the respective countries." This speech has become a veritable slogan, of which each successive Quai d'Orsay chief has made use.

Further, we all know that practically speaking, especially during the last crisis, as we shall see, a democratic nation under the capitalistic system controls the Press.

It can also be said of the chief of staff, and of all the French military men, that whatever may be their opinions they do not express them, nor hold to them against the will of the Government. There are no State officials more disciplined than the great military chiefs. At most, in the colonies some military men arrogated to themselves a certain independence. The events of March 7th stand as proof of the respect of French military men for the Government, whatever Government may be in power.

On the other hand, the important place that diplomatic observers in France have accorded to the financiers in the last crisis is proof of the fact that there again the public powers have dispensed with a formidable means of action.

We observe, therefore, that the capitalistic democracies had in their hands weapons which assured them of enough power to bring the dictatorships to their knees, to impose limitations on their demands, or acceptable solutions to international problems, or to win a sure victory in case the dictatorships' "war blackmail" had led them into a conflict with the democracies.

In the domain of strictly material reality, the democratic Governments had everything the dictatorships lacked. They had oil, for example. But since Germany could not count on Roumanian oil, and as long as the Franco-Russian agreement, disregarded not only in your country but in my own as well, prevented Russia from reaching an agreement with Germany, the

Reich would have no oil beyond what it could manufacture synthetically, or what it had in store.

Before the last crisis the dictatorships had no wheat of their own. They lacked the necessary nourishment. They also lacked sufficient funds—all the world's gold being held by the U.S.S.R. and the democracies. We must not forget that the power of the democracies lies precisely in the fact that they are not perpetually "mobilized," and that, therefore, their strength is incalculable. If the dictatorships, with their forces always in readiness, have an advantage at the beginning of hostilities, eventually they would be proved clearly deficient.

Finally, as soon as war is declared, in a Democracy everyone is of one mind, whereas in the dictatorships opposition develops. In anticipation of such eventualities, the dictatorships have widely-advertised concentration camps for the suspects.

In order to judge the last crisis competently, we must begin by observing the situation as it presented itself. Never before, since the Entente-Cordiale, had England showed a similar understanding of the European situation. As far as the French Government is concerned, it can be said that they did not really expect to see the English Cabinet gradually align itself beside France in order to support the latter's allies in Central Europe.

And little by little America drew closer to France, and Russia showed its desire to hold to its international obligations, while the Spanish Republic was making

The Confusion of Western Democracy

headway on the Ebro against the troops of Franco. Mussolini himself hesitated to plunge into the great adventure at Hitler's side. Hitler had gone so far since the Nuremberg Congress that he had only two alternatives: a thorough defeat, or a thundering victory.

In France, morale was perfect, in spite of the continued gaps in the air force. Obviously there was a risk here. This was the unknown element in the "poker party." The stake was a big one. It was necessary that France, with a direct interest, take the initiative in the action. But she did not take it.

However one looks at it, the two Governments were perfectly able to act, that is, to use the power they had in their hands. But what happened?

It was easy to see that the gigantic class struggle, begun so many years before, had entered into a bitter phase, since the dictators had put heavy pressure on the democratic Governments. In this Czechoslovakian-affair, the international of the present ruling classes was moved by many other considerations. Haven't you all, or at any rate some among you, had the impression that every time the dictators got into serious difficulties, the capitalistic systems were benevolently disposed to help re-float them? Fundamentally, this has always been the case in every country. It has always been capitalistic systems which have installed dictators, without realizing that they were to be themselves, some day, the first victims.

We must not forget that it was really France and

Mr. Austen Chamberlain who, in 1925, saved the day for Mussolini when he was in deep trouble after the murder of Matteotti: "Every dictatorship in Europe is useful if it can help maintain order!" That was the slogan of the hour. And it was then that Sir Austen Chamberlain made a cruise to Livorno to meet the Duce. The latter made use of this meeting to strengthen his position.

The following year, Sir Austen rendered the same services to Primo de Rivera, making a cruise to Barcelona. The French had nothing to say; M. Barrere, their ambassador in Rome, followed the same policy.

The capitalistic democracies have not had less solicitude for Hitler. Hitler, furthermore, himself revealed in his Nuremberg speech the secret of his diplomatic successes. He made a comparison between his party's situation on the eve of its entering into power, January 30, 1933, and the Third Reich's situation on the eve of its hegemony over Europe. He had no trouble in proving that his saviour in each case was capitalism.

The day after his electoral success of September 1932, von Papen went by aeroplane to Cologne, and in the villa of the banker, Schroeder, met Hitler. From there he went to Dortmund to the representatives of big industry, then to the home of General Schleicher. Von Papen saved Hitler! Why?

The *Deutsche Fuhrerbriefe*, confidential correspondence published through the German Industrial Committee,

printed at the time a sensational article, entitled: "The Social Consolidation of Capitalism," and closed with the following phrase: "Between the two possibilities of a consolidation of the bourgeois regime and Communist revolution, there is no third possibility." A Communist danger had never been more distant in Germany than it was in 1932. The deep schism in the working class had prevented any fruitful opposition to the *coup d'état* of July 20th. Hitler had succeeded in frightening influential groups in heavy industry, high finance, and among landed proprietors, with the Bolshevik spectre. So they risked the "leap in the dark," as the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* expressed it on January 30, 1933.

In his book, *The Offensive*, in speaking of the period of the fight for power, Herr Goebbels remarked that the idea "that Democracy had furnished its mortal enemies with the means of destroying it would always remain one of the better bits of democratic humbug! Democratic stupidity could be beautifully turned to account. The adherents of the National Socialist Party understood, too, and they were highly amused!"

What Herr von Papen was yesterday, Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier are to-day. Once more, Herr Hitler promises to spare the interests of the powerful if they will leave him a free hand against the weak, and once more it is believed.

But here the comparison becomes less exact. The promises that Hitler made in the salon of the Cologne villa he could keep, but the promises he made at

Berchtesgaden to Mr. Chamberlain he cannot keep. The aggrandizement of Germany cannot be carried out except at the expense of the other states which are already "great." To keep the pledge made to the pan-Germanic imperialists, he must fail to keep his pledges to the English imperialists.

That is why the Munich agreement constitutes a defeat for the democracies, particularly when one thinks in terms of realistic interests, abandoning all ideological considerations. At Munich, the democratic Powers had their vital interests to defend, as well as the interests of peace. Are these two interests contradictory? Not at all; on the contrary, the vital interests of Great Britain and France are absolutely identical with the larger general interest—peace. Neither Great Britain nor France wishes a new partitioning of the world, but the totalitarian countries do. If the democratic Powers defend their interests in common, their superiority is so great that a war is impossible.

This is the idea that is the basis of the conviction that peace is indivisible and that security is collective. As long as the democracies clung to this idea, there was no confusion. Everything was clear. On May 21st, it was sufficient for Sir Neville Henderson, His Majesty's ambassador in Berlin, to order his special train for Hitler to retreat. On September 12th, Herr von Ribbentrop only shrugged his shoulders when His Majesty's ambassador said almost the same thing as he had said on May 21st. Von Ribbentrop knew better

The Confusion of Western Democracy

than the other man that behind these words there no longer was the will to put them into action.

The gigantic poker game was really not very dangerous for Hitler, because he knew what hands the others held. Certain personalities in our two countries took pains, and not without success, to assure Herr Hitler that he had no reason to be worried—democratic confusion was in full flight.

As we can see, "dictatorship" for the majority of men means "order," "the maintenance of the privileges of certain classes in society," and above all, "a battle against Communism." This discovery of Hitler's, consisting of standing before the world as the antidote for Communism, is certainly the idea from which his whole success originates. This warps every problem which confronts the world, to such an extent that there is ever but a small minority of men, who, presented with the dilemma of "Communism or Nazi-ism" would not immediately choose the latter eventuality.

"Rather Hitler than Cachin," certain people in France repeated with conviction. This idea, falsely rooted in men's minds, cannot for the majority of them be uprooted. When we stroll through the most fashionable salons of the French capital, we encounter this reasoning between every cup of tea, every cocktail, cigarette, and sandwich. It is true that these ideas have become embedded to such an extent that a number of French people, during the middle of last winter, sent their money to Germany.

It must always be remembered that this fight against Communism is Hitler's great hobby-horse. It is claimed in France that every time German diplomats meet with the responsible French ministers, they always let them understand how much easier relations between France and Germany would be, if only the French leaders would launch a fight against Communism, or exclude the Communists from the governmental majority!

It is clear that this hobby-horse of Hitler's will go still further, and that in a very short time we will see Germany and Italy open a series of diplomatic operations in order to obtain adherence from each state to the anti-Comintern pact. You know as well as I that at the end of the von Ribbentrop-Mussolini conversations in Rome, the latter proposed to Hitler a new signing of the anti-Comintern pact between Germany, Italy, and Japan. That is to say, the new agreement would commit the three states equally to mutual assistance in the event of "Communism" attacking any one of them.

Consequently, German and Italian propaganda reverts very often to this form of anti-Communism; and I leave it to you to realize how powerful this propaganda was in France during the last crisis.

This spectre of Communism, masterfully handled in Paris between the first and the thirtieth of September, constituted, in the class struggle of which we were speaking, a considerable trump card in the hands of the rulers of the hour. An argument often heard in

The Confusion of Western Democracy

certain governmental circles was that if Germany were resisted, with the aid of the U.S.S.R., of the Czech Republic, of the U.S.A., and of all the democratic countries and former neutrals, and the little Spanish Republic, which then assumed all its importance, it was certain that, even if it did not go as far as war, such a moral success over the dictatorships would be obtained that the elements of the Left would find themselves reinforced in every country. Thus the whole order of things which the capitalistic regime allows, and which in everybody's judgment, even in the judgment of its beneficiaries, is tending to disappear, found itself menaced.

In Paris, during the crisis, I personally saw a good many people, but I did not see a single banker, nor a single president of an industrial trust, who was urging the Government towards anything but an arrangement with Berlin, even to the detriment of the future. The idea that the more Nazi-ism triumphed, the more pan-Germanism would stretch its economic and commercial tentacles across the whole world did not occur to these gentlemen. They always looked at it this way: "The present capitalistic order is seriously threatened, and it will certainly not survive a European upheaval. If we must go to the point of war, there will be universal Communism afterwards."

To argue with them on the basis of simple fact is a task which for my part I have attempted more than once, but I am always vanquished. Even if I succeeded

in making these people understand that a communistic France was inconceivable, they often added immediately, "Yes, but it will be the end of the present regime, the end of a certain civilization, of certain traditions, and of certain forms of life to which we are attached above all others, and we don't want it."

Perhaps we journalists have a prejudiced outlook, but during the crisis it seemed to us that in the ante-chambers of the important ministries we certainly encountered more representatives of the "Two Hundred Families," of the banks, and the big industrial trusts, than we had ever before in our lives seen assembled together! I will not attempt to speak about the Bourse, because I know very little about it. But it is obvious that journalists were often invited to adopt a moderate course and spare the Bourse as much as possible.

Clearly and definitely, one of the deep impressions left with us as a result of the September crisis, is that the class struggle was strongly manifested. Outside certain political elements, all classes, the *petite bourgeois*, intellectuals, the military, and working classes without exception, expressed themselves much as did the brave concierge of my house, who patiently awaited my return every night in order to learn the latest news of the situation: "Is it turning out all right, madame? It would be very sad to have a new war, but if it is necessary, we will be as brave as the Chinese and the Spaniards, we will endure it." He added, as he was

The Confusion of Western Democracy

taking us up in the lift, "I certainly hope our Government will not give in to Hitler."

The next morning, as we were leaving a taxi at the office, the driver said to us, while giving us our change, "Sooner or later, it is always the same. These dictators understand only one language, but you will see what they will get out of it. They will be helped once more."

In the afternoon we heard much the same thing, as we talked in the Metro or in the streets, with this person and that. When important events occur in France it is always somewhat as Chateaubriand describes in the first book of his *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, in connection with the beginning of the great French Revolution: "It is the whole human species that promenades, as on holidays, in the streets. Each one speaks to his neighbour, and is astonished to learn that he knows so little of his contemporaries."

The Government had in its hands the power of money, industry, and the Press. It could have done exactly as it wished with these three forces. What did it do? Without entering into details, which you know as well as I, the French Government appeared to employ precisely these three forces of which we have just spoken, to curb the spirit which was leading the nation towards an execution of its signed agreements, whatever consequences might result, and in spite of what we may call the instinct of the democracies to unite and defend themselves against a common danger. Once more the capitalistic regimes have capitulated

before Hitler's bluff. This time the game was even more complicated than usual, and Hitler lead it on five fields at the same time: the fields of internal politics, economics, militarism, diplomacy, and ideology.

Hitler thundered at Nuremburg: "The German people are all behind me!" But, the danger passed, the National-Socialist newspapers published every day, without exception, complaints and threats on the subject of the "defeatists," those "who had packed their trunks," the "street fighters," the cowards, those who spread rumours, the scandal-mongers, "those who lay in ambush." It is characteristic that the organ which unleashed so real a campaign against those who refused to believe in Hitler's victory, was *Das Schwarze Korps*, organ of the S.S. and Gestapo. This newspaper, in a manifesto addressed to the German people, urged them to "point out the residence of every person who was notoriously waiting in ambush, refused to work, and who was a parasite."

In the Paris newspaper, *Le Jour*, which cannot be called anti-Fascist, M. Leon Bailby wrote on October 26th: "I have received from an American diplomat, who is not stationed in Berlin, but who sojourned there the last two weeks in September, this significant communication: 'All at once, on September 27th, the rumour was spread abroad that we were on the eve of war, and that an attack on the Sudeten territories would correspond with the entrance of French and English troops into war. This same day, two motorized

divisions, equipped for war, crossed the great arteries of Berlin. Then for the first time since the Führer became Führer, public opinion became articulate. Men and women, shaking their fists at the troops, cried, "Down with war!" "

It was in the beginning of September that the workers committed the first acts of sabotage in the factories. The management of a large enterprise in Berlin, an armament works, was forced to display the following sign: "Instruments and machines have been disappearing in frightful quantities. Machines are lying idle in certain sections, and work is being stopped at a more and more rapid rate. It seems to be a case of premeditated and organized sabotage."

On September 24th every German newspaper published an official appeal, addressed by the authorities to the public, to "hunt down the traitors of the Fatherland, and to fight against spying and sabotage." We must take into account the fact that in the bosom of a dictatorship, arming itself massively with a view to a war of aggression, an attitude of peace among the public practically amounts to revolution.

In 1914 this situation did not exist. The German people went to war with true enthusiasm. To-day no one dares to pretend that the Germans are enthusiastically for the war. Although the population was ignorant of almost all that was really happening, and could only catch a glimpse, or guess, at the world coalition which was in September in the process of

being rapidly formed against Hitler, without any definite knowledge, men and women were seized with an unspeakable war panic. The Czech border authorities registered, at this time, an average of fifty German deserters per day; they were soldiers of the Regular Army, crossing the frontier and throwing down their guns before a shot had been fired by the Czech frontier guards.

But it is not only the fear of war which makes the hinterland dangerous in case there should be war. Almost every class of the German population is discontented. The workers complain of the forced labour, the "drill," of the rise in prices, the lowering of wages, and the restrictions on food. In spite of all prohibitions, struggles for a rise in wages and against overtime work provoke more and more incidents. Certain Nazis, above all, the "old-timers," take an active part in the demonstrations, and only because they have been deceived, because life is made difficult for them whilst the leaders wallow in unbelievable luxury. The peasants take every opportunity to sabotage the directed economy. Never have the German peasants been so opposed to a regime as they are to Hitler's.

In the cities the middle classes are indignant at the crushing taxes, and at the fact that the promise to socialize the department-stores has not been fulfilled. In accordance with the four-year plan the workers are deprived of their independence: they must work in the factories. The merchants and industrialists are driven

to the wall by the big trusts and rave against the economic bureaucracy which hampers their initiative.

Twenty-six million Catholics form a united *bloc*, animated by a spirit of fanatic opposition. The Protestant "Confessional Church" (*Bekenntniskirche*) carry on a catacomb warfare against the terror of the Ministry of Worship. At Bradford, on the occasion of the reunion of the "Congregational Union," Mr. Moore, who is its "headmaster," gave a moving report on the illegal organization of the "Confessional Church," holding its synods in caves.

On October 27th the newspaper, *Das Schwarze Korps*, organ of the S.S. and of Herr Hitler's secret police, settled their accounts against the Catholic and Protestant Churches, "because of political manifestations, treason, and sabotage, committed in face of the spirit of sacrifice of the German people, in the gravest hours of their destiny." The Catholics, the Protestants, the factory workers, the Democrats, all are "traitors of the Fatherland, and obstructionists." What remains of the pretended unanimity of the whole German people behind Hitler, to carry on a war of conquest?

The great discontent of the German people is one of the chief reasons why Hitler is so avid for success in the international field, and why he ventures to the very brink of the abyss, where he must risk all on a single card. The occupation of Austria was effective only for a few weeks, but quickly Hitler's difficulties became even greater.

At Nuremberg, Hitler and Goering declared loudly that Germany had nothing to fear from a blockade. Their economic argument is merely a large-scale bluff. At that same moment the economic review, *Der Deutsche Volkswirt*, Dr. Schacht's organ, demanded the rationing of food provisions, saying that otherwise they could not ward off the shortage which would result in certain provisions and fodder. In the same review Dr. Schacht's contributor, Dr. Tomberg, demonstrated the dangers of autarchy. He wrote: "A country, such as Germany, which cannot feed itself by its own means, and which cannot provision itself from its own raw materials, must aspire to accumulate gold reserves and foreign specie, in order to be prepared, if the occasion arises, to buy the materials which it lacks."

The author, after having observed that the United States, Great Britain, and France, together controlled more than 76 per cent of the world's gold, and that Germany did not control even one per cent, concluded with melancholy, that: "A Great Power which enters into a war without allies, without immense resources, and without a possibility of buying merchandise from neutral states, must always lose a war against an alliance of states which are perhaps inferior in military potential, but which are superior in the economic field, and which have good commercial relations and credits."

Did the democracies take stock of their power? When the democratic Powers, France, Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union, are compared

with the Fascist axis, Germany, Italy, and Japan, we see that the democracies have twelve times the mineral production of their opponents, four times as much production of coal, three and a half times the production of raw iron and steel. The supplementary raw materials for the manufacture of steel, such as magnesium, tungsten, chromium, and nickel, simply do not exist in the Fascist States. The democratic Powers' production of copper ore is more than thirty times as great as that of the Fascist States; production of oil is two hundred and forty times greater in the democratic states; while, because the three Fascist Powers lack the same raw materials, they cannot make good each other's deficiencies.

In contrast, their needs are growing. As to foodstuffs, Germany, in peace time, by intensifying its production, and rigorously limiting consumption, can meet 80 per cent of its needs. In war time, as a result of the diminution of cultivated land, and the greater consumption of the troops, this percentage falls to sixty. The German wheat stores for war-time needs amount to from two and a half to three million tons. This would last some months.

Briefly, the autarchy and the affirmation that Germany is protected from every blockade is a bluff and nothing more. The storm being over, the *National-Zeitung* of Essen told the truth: "These last few days, since Hitler's final speech at Nuremberg, the nightmare of a coalition against Germany, which did not let Bismarck sleep, was

brought again to the attention of the German people.”
(October 1, 1938.)

Hitler declared at Nuremberg: “No one can compel us to capitulate. We are invincible.” Up to the present time, we have been able to measure Hitler’s war potential on the occasions of military reviews, or in the occupation, without a struggle, of Austria and the Sudeten territories. On these occasions certain faults, notably in materials, were revealed. These deficiencies will rapidly disappear. The Italian Army has waged war only against the unarmed and unprotected Abyssinians. The experiences gained from the Spanish War have demonstrated the inferiority of Italian and German tanks and planes in comparison with Soviet tanks and planes.

But let us compare the military potential of the Italo-German-Japanese axis with that of the democratic *bloc*, Great Britain, France, the United States, the Soviet Union, and since we are considering the situation as it was before the Munich agreement, we include Czecho-Slovakia. The reserves of the three axis Powers amount to fourteen and a half million men, those of the democratic Powers amount to forty million; without the United States, thirty million, and with China, fifty million.

The democracies possess twice as many planes as the totalitarian states, the ratio of warships is three to one in favour of the democracies. (These figures are taken from official German statistics.)

We can understand the relief of the German leaders when they obtained their booty without striking a blow. The German generals opposed Hitler's foreign policy up to the last moment; but they were wrong! They did not know that the confusion of the democracies is so great that they no longer think and throw overboard all the normal measures of politics and diplomacy. This *Kraftprobe* method, a demonstration of force, gave Hitler so much pleasure that he ordered all the German newspapers to publish, contrary to the most basic rules of prudence, photographs and descriptions of the Siegfried line. "See how strong we are!" Nothing could more clearly emphasize the character of the rearmament bluff than this rather too obvious advertisement!

Another echo of Hitler's fanfare: "We are no longer isolated!" When, on the night of September 30th, Roosevelt sent his message to Hitler, the message in which he held Hitler responsible for a new world war, and asked him to take part in an international conference at which all interested countries would be present, Hitler was, in reality, so completely hemmed in that only a miracle could save him.

The Soviet Union, through Mr. Litvinoff in Geneva, as well as through its ambassadors in Paris and London, and its minister in Prague, had left no doubt about the fact that it would fulfil its obligations under the pact of mutual assistance which tied it to France and Czechoslovakia. A note issued by the Foreign Office,

and confirmed by Mr. Chamberlain, as well as by M. Daladier, announced that in case France, in fulfilling its obligations toward Czecho-Slovakia, gave the latter its armed assistance against a non-provoked aggression, Great Britain and the Soviet Union would place themselves at France's side.

That same day Belgrade and Bucharest made known to the Hungarian Government that the pact of the Little Entente was still in force. The Soviet Union pointed out in a dramatic fashion that Poland's eastern frontiers were menaced. The United States of America was on the point of taking the step which during the Great War they dared take only after three years of war. It was a real question of a world coalition, incomparably stronger than in 1914, and it would have been mad to risk a war under such circumstances.

In the *Deutsches Adelsblatt*, General von Metzsch published the following warning: "We must not forget in considering any single favourable detail the situation of Germany as a whole, which is rather grave."

Even Mussolini hesitated and sought a way out. The saviours arrived from the great general headquarters of Democracy. For to the bluff in the domain of internal politics, to the economic, military, and diplomatic bluffs, was added the ideological bluff, bringing the confusion of the democracies to a climax, and thus opening the way to a Hitler victory, arrived at without war and without effort.

Of what did this ideological bluff consist? It was

simply a question of applying the methods which had resulted in the fall of the Weimar Republic to the struggle which should result in a hegemony over Europe.

When, on July 20, 1932, the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Commander-in-Chief of the State Police, Herr Severing, allowed himself to be arrested by a second lieutenant and two soldiers, thus giving up a primary position to the enemy, he declared that by this action he had hoped to avoid the shedding of blood. National-Socialism, in effect, was threatened with losing a civil war, and Severing took into account the normal man's desire for peace and quiet. There is no more natural desire than that for peace.

On September 30th, every people ardently wanted peace. This desire, under certain conditions, could have resulted in a compromise. But if one of the parties knows in advance that the other party is a partisan of peace at any price, then compromise becomes capitulation. But capitulation does not produce peace, for even if the motives of the conflict disappear, the reasons for it remain, and always create new situations, pregnant with conflict. In the hands of the totalitarian states, pacifism becomes a weapon of diversion.

In his book, *Grundlagen Einer Deutschen Wehrpolitik* (National-Socialist Library, part twelve), Colonel Hierl, since promoted to the rank of General, Chief and Organizer of the Labour Service, wrote as follows: "There are two kinds of pacifism: true pacifism, which

results from a morbid tendency, from weakness or blindness, but which is sincere, and hypocritical pacifism. The latter constitutes a method of political combat, and serves for the preparation of war. In deluding the adversary with pacifistic phrases, the latter is led to neglect his armament. The illusion in which the adversary believes, serves to hide the real preparations for war."

Herr Goebbels simply mocks pacifism: "Never again war! That is the cry of those who give up. Unfortunately, so far no one has conceived of the idea of founding a league with the slogan: 'Never again a stomach-ache!' They would be just as sensible as our friends of peace!" (*Der Angriff*, of March 12, 1928.)

Abusing the desire for peace among the people is one of the most effective methods of the aggressors. They have succeeded in making the true friends of peace appear as the "instigators of war," and only the isolationists find favour in their eyes! "Peace" to the aggressors means a localized war—or the capitulation of the others.

If it were not for their confusion in the matter of peace, the democratic statesmen, aware of their superiority, would have been able, on September 30, 1938, to have imposed peace, and a peace such as we have always understood it. That is to say, in the acceptance of the term as President Roosevelt used it, the settlement of differences arising from contradictory interests, not by recourse to force and violence, but by

pacific means. On September 30th, it would have been easier to have forced Hitler to retreat than on May 21st.

But the ideological bluff consisted not only of profiting by the people's desire for peace, in putting over a blackmailing threat, but in profiting at the same time by the interpretation of the principle of "self-determination of peoples." Herr Goebbels, who always proclaimed the stupidity of the Weimar Republic could, after this major stroke, extend the description to world democracy. Self-determination of peoples is a democratic principle, and can only be applied within the scope of democracy. Just as it was in pure demagogery that the Nazi totalitarian party used the principle of universal suffrage, which sprang from Democracy, to achieve power in Germany, so Hitler used the principle established by Wilson, to finish, once and for all, with rights and principles.

It was thus that the Austrian people were sacrificed in the name of this democratic principle. It was the same as far as the Sudeten were concerned. The Sudeten Germans, even those who had voted for Henlein, had voted for their national rights within Czechoslovakia, and not for an *Anschluss* with the Reich, of which they had never been a part. A democratic vote on the question of separating two peoples which had lived together since the thirteenth century never took place.

How can a nation demand the democratic right of self-determination, when it refuses to apply the same

right to its own constituents? In reality, the right of self-determination of peoples in Hitler's hands is only a sort of dynamite destined to blow up the states of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, which without exception are states made up of different nationalities. Poland has 31.1 per cent minority population, Roumania 28.1 per cent, Yugoslavia 25.6 per cent, and Latvia 24.5 per cent, etc.

A *Linguistic Map of Central Europe*, published after the annexation of Austria by the *Volksbund fur das Deutschstum im Ausland*, puts at thirteen millions the number of Germans living in Europe beyond the borders of the Third Reich. The German language territory, according to this map, includes fourteen different states. The number of Germans in the entire world is estimated at 100,337,000, of which 78,000,000 live within the borders of the Reich.

Herr Heinrich Rogge, professor of National-Socialist International Law, has published a book entitled *The Peace Policy of Hitler, and International Law*. The author attributes to Hitler the creation of a new International Law, where peoples are substituted for nations as subjects of the law. As for what remains of the rights of men, they are replaced by popular law (*Volksrecht*), based on the blood of the people instead of the bloodless scheme of the nation.

Backed by this theory, Hitler could to-morrow raise up the Irish against Great Britain, the Bretons against France, the Arabs against France and England. And

has this not already been done? Everyone who attributes to totalitarian states ideas which have meaning only within a Democracy, should not be astonished by the consequences.

The high-handedness with which National-Socialism manipulates certain ideas, with a view to gaining its ends, manifests itself more clearly when it poses as the saviour of humanity against Bolshevism. There are many things hidden behind the screen of this slogan.

According to the newspaper *Das Schwarze Korps* the Vatican and Mr. Anthony Eden are Bolsheviks. It goes without saying that France, Freemasonry, Mr. Beneš, and the League of Nations are also "Bolshevistic." On the occasion of the last party congress, Herr Goebbels demonstrated that at bottom Democracy is nothing more than camouflaged Bolshevism. When in 1936 a conflict broke out on the subject of Danzig, the *Gauleiter Förster* declared that the Constitution of the Free City was spreading Bolshevism. In his book, *Blood and Honour* (page 305), Herr Alfred Rosenberg writes that Bolshevism shows itself in every degenerate movement. According to Hitler's speech at the 1934 Nuremberg Congress, a speech entitled "Culture and Art," it was possible to discover Bolshevism in the architectural style of houses with flat roofs. According to Rosenberg, *Gestaltung und Idee* (page 373), Zionism is identical with Bolshevism. Judaism is the chief form of Bolshevism, as understood by the National-Socialists.

There can be no doubt about the fact that this

"Bolshevist" tag is attached by the National-Socialist propaganda to every adversary, and it continues to apply this simple method of defamation. Czechoslovakia was denounced as "Bolshevist" at the moment it was suspected of belonging to a coalition opposed to Germany, and desiring to resist German hegemony.

In Herr Hitler's speech at Saarbrücken on October 8th, he named those whose inclusion in the British Cabinet would suffice to qualify Great Britain as a Bolshevik nation. At the same time, the National-Socialists again called the English, as they had during the Great War, "a people of merchant Jews." For the racial theory of the Nazis constitutes an instrument of the Third Reich's policy of alliances. This is clear from the fact that the Japanese were honoured by being declared "Aryan," while in France only those who approved of the policy extolled by M. Pierre-Etienne Flandin enjoyed this privilege.

And the bluff succeeded, as you well know, beyond all hopes! If the capitalist regimes had entered the game whole-heartedly with all their weapons what would have happened?

One of three things. Either, knowing that all the countries were ready to wage war for Czechoslovakia, Hitler would have withdrawn, and the democratic-capitalist countries could have forced the dictators to halt in their onrush.

Or, secondly, Hitler would have followed out his plan of aerial attack on Czechoslovakia, a plan which we

will enlarge upon later. In this case, the disorganization of Czechoslovakia would have been considerable, as Hitler hoped at the end of three weeks Mr. Beneš' army would have been decimated and the people annihilated, since the great democracies could have begun an appreciable action only on the western front.

In this case, Hitler would then have declared peace, saying that he waged war against no one, but that he wished to have his way in Czechoslovakia. But then the great democracies, having undergone unimaginable expenses, and having mobilized the courage of their entire populations, would have been obliged to impose conditions of peace on the Führer which would nevertheless have inflicted a set-back on the dictators.

Or, third and last hypothesis, Czechoslovakia, not being exhausted after three weeks of struggle, a type of general war would have begun, which at the start would have been appalling for our two countries, in that our aviation forces would not have been sufficiently strong, and our large cities and our civil populations would have suffered terribly. But General Gamelin concluded in his famous speech to the Council of Ministers: "After the terrible début, France and England could nevertheless have dictated the peace." In this case it would certainly not be to Hitler and Mussolini that peace would be dictated, according to the opinion of all the observers on hand, because at the end of a year of war they would no longer have existed. Then, can I say that there could still have existed an

obstacle to a European, and even a world, entente? So where are we now? Is it really a peace which was signed at Munich, or is it not rather simply a delay of war? Is the Führer going to continue the execution of his gigantic scheme, bolstering up Italy for the execution of her own? It is probable; it is certain, for the Munich agreement considerably weakened the strategical positions of the Franco-British forces.

The immediate consequence of the Munich agreement is the loss of Czecho-Slovakia to the democratic countries' system of alliances. From the military point of view, this means the loss of an army of 200,000 men in peace time, and a reserve of 2,700,000 men; it means the loss of 9,000 light machine guns and 3,500 heavy machine guns, of 450 heavy artillery guns, and 800 light cannon, of 350 tanks, and of 1,300 military planes. It means the loss of a strategic salient, thrust into the heart of Germany, immobilizing a German aggressor by means of forts and air bases, and forcing her to make war on three fronts.

It means, finally, the loss of an armament industry which furnishes 15 per cent of the world's total armament production. Cession of the Sudeten territory transformed Czecho-Slovakia from a platform against Germany to a springboard for Germany. Indirect consequences are the disintegration of the Little Entente; all the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe are falling into Germany's lap. It means also the political and economic advance of

The Confusion of Western Democracy

Germany into Asia Minor and the frontiers of India, passing through Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria, and Turkey.

Importations from Roumania into Germany have tripled since 1934. Almost half of the foreign commerce of Hungary passes through Germany. Since 1936, the Germans have increased ten-fold their investments in Yugoslavia. To the granting of a credit of £16,000,000 to Turkey by Great Britain, Germany replied by the grant of a credit of 150,000,000 marks in merchandise.

That is not all. Henceforth, the Germans will oppose the granting of English credits to the countries in question, for moral reasons, probably. Here is the argument: they say that in 1937 50·2 per cent of Turkish exports took the German road, and only 4·4 per cent the English road. The *National Zeitung* of Essen writes on this topic as follows: "A country forced to accept credits can only pay back in intensifying its exchanges with the creditor country. These conditions do not exist where the Anglo-Turkish exchanges are concerned."

On his return to Berlin after his trip among the Balkan countries, Herr Funck, Reichminister of National Economy, pulled an entirely new axis out of his valise: the Balkan axis, composed of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Turkey, with the possibility of extending it to Iran and Iraq, and perhaps to Roumania and Greece. Herr Funck made the following comment: "South-Eastern Europe and Asia Minor possess nearly everything that

Germany needs. We are already buying there, at the present time, twice as much as England, France and the United States put together."

But Hitler does not stop at Turkey. From 1929 to 1936, Germany's share in imports from Iran went up from 7·3 per cent to 11·1 per cent; that of England fell during the same period from 19·1 per cent to 10·6 per cent.

This movement has already affected India. The commercial travellers of Hamburg and the specialists of Herr Himmler, chief of the Reich's secret police, on the question of minorities, have already arrived at the other end of the trans-Eurasian axis, the Persian Gulf. Here, on the frontiers of India, in the naphtha basin of Mosul, in the regions bordering on the Suez Canal. It is not the vital interests of the Soviet Union that are at stake but, indeed, the vital interests of the British Empire.

The review, the *Deutsche Wehr*, organ of the Reich Ministry of War, alluded in its issue of October 20, 1938, to the fact that in principle England had already renounced the great imperial route to India by way of Suez, and that she was engaged in fortifying the much more certain Cape route, by installing fuel reservoirs at St. Helena, and by constructing fortifications on Seal Island in front of the Cape. "The distance from Southampton to Colombo by Port Said is half the distance separating Southampton and the Cape."¹

¹ This reckoning is obviously incorrect.

The Confusion of Western Democracy

The Arab independence movement and the Italian victory forces the English to overcome this geographical reality." The organ of the Ministry of War adds that: "If, some day, the petrol of Mosul no longer comes to Haifa, England will have to fall back on its petrol base in Central America."

One of the indirect consequences of Munich is the menace which threatens the route to India. And when one considers the Berlin-Rome-Tokio triangle as a whole, it is necessary to add the formidable threat directed simultaneously at every weak spot of the British Empire: the North Sea, Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, the Persian Gulf, and Hong Kong. Those who saved Hitler at Munich believed the promises he gave not to threaten their vital interests. But what possible goal can the Fascist triangle have, if not that of threatening the vital interests of Great Britain and France?

The cleverly chosen name, "anti-Comintern," created a dangerous confusion. Why do German agents go to Palestine and Asia Minor to organize *putschs* and insurrection, and to seize trade? Why don't they attack the Soviet Ukraine? Why does the Japanese Army march on Canton instead of on Vladivostock; why does she cut off Hong Kong? Why does Hitler demand the Cameroons and the Belgian Congo in Africa, territories which are far enough away from Soviet frontiers, but forming with Libya and Ethiopia an Italo-German dominion in Africa, giving France and England the

alternatives of starting a world war for Lake Tchad or renouncing Africa? Are we waiting for an attack by Italy on Odessa?—or on Gibraltar, which is so neat, and so easy to reach by sea or by land?

There is no doubt about it—the promises which Hitler made at Munich, he cannot keep. That is why, even if one takes full account of the ends sought by those who saved the peace, Munich constitutes a defeat. England must abdicate, and what would become of France if she followed M. Flandin's advice to withdraw within herself, Herr Rosenberg has explained with great frankness in his book, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, of which I will cite one passage:

"Only an intelligent France will be prepared to readjust the nation. It is true that this could not be done on the old traditional Nordic basis, but only by virtue of her Alpine-western-racial character. She must renounce her hegemony in Europe, recognizing the necessity which nature imposes on her, and must give up her interest in Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and the other Little Entente countries. She must energetically eliminate the negro and Jewish population, and content herself with frontiers conditioned by her population. Germany would not hinder such a France in her consecration to her civilization." (Page 641.)

This generous offer of a cultural autonomy accorded to France in the framework of a Germanic-Europe

The Confusion of Western Democracy

constitutes, after the loss of Czecho-Slovakia, the final goal of a policy which would make France's future depend on the generosity of the Munich conquerors. Under these conditions, if we suppose that Mr. Chamberlain succeeds better than his father, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—who from 1899 to 1902 did his best to arrive at an Anglo-German concord—and reaches the signing of a splendid document with Germany, more or less leaving France to muddle through on its own, momentarily at least, one cannot see a very long future for peace.

What would happen in England, for example, if Germany brutally made it known to France that she must again cede Alsace-Lorraine and her former colonies, and even more than her former colonies? What would happen if Germany demanded that France demilitarize her frontier zones, or made some other demand which I cannot even guess at, since it is difficult to predict what is going on in the minds of the dictators. The more one sees of them, the more one is inclined to believe that the plans which they project would have made even the most avaricious of the conquerors of history recoil in horror.

My uncle, M. Jules Cambon, was accustomed to repeat in the later years of his life: "It is never easy to change a country's foreign policy, because it is in general governed by something which men cannot change. This something is geography." But geographically speaking, France and England form almost a

single country. To attack one is to injure the other. To undermine the colonial empire of one is to threaten that of the other. In effect, England cannot return colonies to Germany, even if France were willing, to appease the Führer. To restore his former colonies of Togo and Cameroon, to restore the black peoples to the Nazi rulers, who have made the racial myth the first item in their programme, is, from the purely humanitarian and moral point of view, to say the least, a questionable action.

What would happen? In less than a year, all of central Africa would be poisoned by Nazi propaganda, that is, a type of Arabian war would be let loose, as in Palestine, against the Jews and their protectors. That Germany would find a means of raising an army of three or four million blacks in the two colonies of Togo and Cameroon, as Mr. Zimmerman did not conceal from the English delegates in the course of the many conferences which took place following the Versailles Treaty, is very probable. Something is bound to happen, as you will understand immediately if you take into account the exact situation which Togo and Cameroon occupy in Central Africa.

If you will look at the map, you will see that the cession of Cameroon and Togo to Germany would seriously modify the situation in Africa for France and England. If you draw a straight line from Rome southward to the Gulf of Guinea, you cut Africa in two. More than this, less than 1,000 kilometres would

The Confusion of Western Democracy

separate the new German colony of Cameroon from Italian Lybia. To-day, with the aeroplane and the automobile, such a relatively small desert distance is easily crossed. The Rome-Berlin axis could easily be extended 2,000 kilometres without difficulty, and so reach Belgian Congo, cutting our African *bloc* into two separate sections. An even more serious consequence, a few German aviation squadrons stationed at well-chosen points in Togo and Cameroon could, at the beginning of a war, destroy every vital French and British centre in Western, Central, and Equatorial Africa, thus blocking the transportation of troops and raw materials to Europe.

It is obvious how important the cession of Togo and Cameroon is to Germany in peace time. Germany could create an anti-French propaganda centre there, and install superb aerial bases. Moreover, on the Cameroon coast, the Reich could establish a remarkably dangerous naval base in the excellent natural harbour of Duola. It is situated at the mouth of the river Wouri, in a vast estuary, full of islands which would be a refuge for hydroplanes and submarines.

With the Mediterranean made impracticable by the Italian Fleet and planes, our maritime communications in the Atlantic threatened by a German base in Duola, transformed into a vast hiding place for pirates, submarines, ships, and aeroplanes, France would find herself practically in a state of blockade.

Such is the dilemma for France and England,

especially for France: either she must resist the German demand for return of the colonies, and by taking a firm stand make war impossible, by reason of the hazards which she presents in the present situation for the Italo-German group, or else she must give in to a false policy of peace and thus risk precipitating France and England into a new war, in which the possession of Togo and Cameroon will give our adversaries the greatest chances of winning.

Several months before his death, Ludendorff wrote in his last work: "If in the present political situation, a world war broke out, North Africa would become the theatre of operations of extraordinary importance, and its results would have a profound effect on European battlefields!" Later, he added a few more lines: "It is clear that if Mussolini adopts a policy of a pan-Arabic protectorate, the Rome-Berlin axis will become stronger than ever."

What do you think will happen to the English colonies in Central Africa, which in fact Germany claims much more than Togo and Cameroon?

Under present conditions, it is impossible to predict at a given time, the inevitable conflict between the "two worlds," the one in which people live in servitude, and where they make cannons and planes, just as in the democracies the bakers make little cakes for a special holiday; or the other world, where everyone lives as he pleases, free, and perhaps even too carefree.

If you will allow me to assume this pessimistic

The Confusion of Western Democracy

hypothesis, which I, for one, can no longer exclude from my thoughts, what will happen?

Certainly what happened in 1914, in case of a general war, for there will be such a struggle for individual liberties, that all the democratic countries of the world will unite, and volunteers will flock by the millions to the side of France and England. But how long will it take to exhaust the dictatorships? That is a question to which we would prefer not to reply.

In any case, one thing is certain—that is, that this time, the mode of life which the capitalists hoped to save in September, from a crisis which would have been much less serious, will withstand only with difficulty such a wide-scale and long-drawn-out struggle.

Thus it will be true for nations, as Descartes said of men: "The greatest enemy of every man is himself."

The capitalists who wished to save their regime at the time of the last crisis, at the price of enormous diplomatic and material capitulations, have worked to destroy it within a given time, it is almost mathematically certain. How can we explain the fact that Hitler's five bluffs were able to succeed? We rightly denounce the power of propaganda. But is it necessary to demonstrate what propaganda means, in reality? It is not limited to the violence of radio broadcasts, or to the volume of newspaper print. Propaganda is not at all a technical problem, but a political problem.

National-Socialist propaganda works with complicity in the very country in which it is spreading its activity.

German propaganda could never create such confusion in democratic countries if, in the very bosom of Democracy, certain classes were not sympathetic to the doctrine of National-Socialism, without, however, daring to advertise the fact. Certain classes are afraid of Democracy, and thus undermine the very foundations of democratic society. They succumb to the slogan of the "Bolshevist danger" just as the Prussian country squires and the Rhine industrialists succumbed before them.

They envy the easy life of the dictators: they don't have to quarrel with a parliamentary opposition. And the National-Socialist propaganda works on their sympathies. A tragic dilemma results. This sympathy of the reactionary factions introduced by Fascism becomes a menace to the very existence of the nation in every country which is threatened by the Fascist triangle.

The results of Munich demonstrate very well that the real goals of Italian and German Fascism can be realized only at the expense of the vital interests of the democratic powers. These powers are the capitalist powers: their property and future are at stake if the manœuvre is successful, in which the democracies aid the totalitarian states to realize their ambitions. The bluffs put up by the totalitarian countries consist in spreading confusion in the democracies, confusion which provokes disharmony among the population of the democratic states whose interests are threatened, and so renders them incapable of defending their common

The Confusion of Western Democracy

interests. If the manœuvre succeeds, it will be the end of the course of capitalism in Western Europe. The riches of the democratic countries will pass into the hands of the new masters, and the social system, which is the basis of these riches, and of the traditional civilization, will go to pieces, even without a war.

Confusion ceases to reign as soon as one honestly defines Democracy. It is useless to insist on this matter. Democracy is impossible without social progress, and social progress is impossible without Democracy. Maintenance of civilization is possible only by strong efforts destined to preserve for the working masses and the consumers the conviction that their material situation will be ameliorated. Even peace can only be preserved at this price. This is what Wickham Steed called in his book, *Vital Peace*, "the adventure of peace." But certain people will say: Isn't all constructive progress questionable, if the dictators, in the centre of the Continent, are overturned? Won't they be followed by Bolshevism, which destroys all, which threatens the democratic system, and consequently will change everything in the Western countries? I have already explained that there is no danger of Communism in France. As for Germany, it is certain that the opposition, even as insignificant and divided as it is, is unanimous on one point, and the Communists among them know that the German people, once delivered from dictatorship, will tolerate only Democracy.

It must not be forgotten that Germany still has not

had a democratic revolution, such as Great Britain had in the seventeenth, and France in the eighteenth centuries. For the revolution of 1918 did not touch the landowners, their power was not broken, and it was they who put Hitler in power in 1933. After Hitler's fall, Germany will be faced with the task begun in 1848 and interrupted by Bismarck's and Hitler's dictatorships, of achieving Democracy.

Thomas Mann, the great writer and Nobel Prize winner, has spoken of the task which the whole German opposition considers as its historic mission: "Under the yoke of National-Socialism, it is true that the workers' have no rights, the syndicates are annihilated, all social organizations are suppressed, but to believe that in consequence the golden age of the industrialists has arrived, is only a dream of Herr Thyssen and other protecting financiers of Herr Hitler, and precisely the contrary has come about. The war economy organized at the present time in what is called the Third Reich, is a form, inferior from the moral point of view, but nevertheless a form of Socialism. It constitutes something which we can call State-Socialism just as well as State-Capitalism, a military dictatorship established and exercised over national economy, completely limiting the initiative of the industrialists, and without doubt, the ruin and the end of an economy based on private capital. The bourgeois of the world should take account of this fact before choosing Fascism because of a panicky fear of Socialism."

The Confusion of Western Democracy

As long as Hitler is in power, the antagonisms which they tried to conciliate at Munich will be brought to light again, and will create a greater and greater danger of war, until a new 1914 will become inevitable.

As soon as one realizes the kind of detente which reigns to-day in our two great democracies, an official detente, artificially maintained by certain rulers through their control of the Press, one cannot refrain from comparing this period with the one we knew in our two countries following Agadir. In fact, when in 1911 the Morocean crisis was happily past, Sir Edward Grey, full of happiness, rejoiced in the House of Commons: "What I wish, and I hope that it will be possible, although at the moment it appears difficult, is that an amelioration of Anglo-German relations will not be exclusive, but will include our friends."

Bonar Law made the following declaration in the same session: "The idea that there is a hostile attitude in England towards Germany is entirely unjustified. Often we hear it said that because of the conflicting interests of the two countries, a war is inevitable. I do not believe in inevitable wars. If a war does break out, it will not be the result of certain fatal laws, but only the result of human stupidity."

And Mr. Asquith, Prime Minister, said nearly the same thing as his colleagues of to-day: "Our friendships have no exclusive nor jealous character, we would be more than happy if we could extend them and include other powers within their conciliatory and pacifistic

sphere. We have no reason for conflict with any great Power in the world; the first and most important interest will always be, to-day as in the future, world peace!"

And what was the reply from Berlin to these peaceful remarks in the House of Commons? During the session of the Reichstag of December 5, 1911, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of the Reich, declared as follows: "We must be armed against all eventualities." Baron von Hartling said: "We must require that the English put up no obstacle to our expansion. With coolness, conscious of their force, basing it on their excellent army, and on their right, the German people march toward the future." Prince Hatzfeld expressed himself as follows: "We must keep our powder dry."

Thirty months later the Great War broke out.

As for myself, generally called "Cassandra" by political adversaries who are polite, and by the others, "The fortune-teller who forgot her spectacles," it seems to me that in order clearly to define the situation of our two great democratic and capitalistic countries, face to face with the dictatorships, I could make a few predictions which will run small risk of being contradicted.

But first of all let me draw your attention to the dizzy development of German diplomatic methods, and to the definite adoption of one of them. This one, given the troublesome internal situation of capitalistic

The Confusion of Western Democracy

democracies faced with dictatorships, is the most dangerous which the Rome-Berlin axis has yet adopted. It consists of the brutal and growing interference by the dictators in the internal politics of France and England. It was at Saarbrücken that the Führer spoke about the "English governesses," but it is every day that his agents in France work against our political figures.

We know that in the conversation which Ribbentrop had with Mussolini and Ciano in Rome, on October 26, it was decided that this new diplomatic tactic should be used and developed simultaneously with the attempt, under pretext of conceding arms limitations, to obtain colonial concessions and other concessions in Europe. It would begin with an Anglo-German agreement in order to separate England and France. Some days later, Marshal Goering represented the Reich at the Vienna meeting to arbitrate the Hungarian-Czech differences. He had a new conversation with Count Ciano on the use of this diplomatic tactic of interfering with the internal politics of the democracies. "We are strong enough not to have to negotiate with the democracies unless their men in power are willing to please us. We do not accept the thesis according to which constitutional countries judge that their Governments, whatever they may be, are always the real expression of the people's will. The negotiations which we are going to take up with England will be in line with this spirit."

And it is believed that Count Ciano decided, on his part, that he would make it understood to the new French ambassador in Rome that the negotiations which Italy were going to open with France, were Daladier-Bonnet-Mussolini negotiations, but that if other men came into power, well, that would be a different matter.

Unfortunately, neither of our two countries has in the past had the feeling that this might happen when Hitler and Mussolini timidly risked a few reflections of this nature in diplomatic negotiations. Let us hope that to-day our two countries will be more perspicacious.

And now, in closing, I would like to summarize all my ideas concerning these predictions on the probable evolution of the situation of our two democracies, which face the dictators.

The dictators, by their eternal "blackmail of war" policy, will reach the point of persuading France and England that anything is better than war, and they will thus obtain enormous concessions. In this case, the two great democracies will probably be in such a diminished diplomatic position, *vis-a-vis* the dictatorships, that London and Paris will be reduced to accepting agreements imposed by the totalitarian countries in every sphere: agreements concerning the Press, economic matters, and perhaps cultural matters. Who knows? This would constitute the daily disintegration of the

whole capitalistic system, and paradoxical as it may seem, this would also be the death of liberty.

Or else the Governments of France and England will defend themselves—as I previously explained to you—and that will lead to the most terrible and longest of general wars. Then, after this trial, a new world will be born, given life amidst such suffering that it will be accepted as it is, with no man daring to arrogate to himself the right of changing it.

Consequently, in this second hypothesis, one can hardly see how the present capitalistic system, which was unwilling to run the risks in September, entailed in the defence of liberty, could long survive this mistake, which has been so costly to those who believe that national honour, human dignity, and personal liberty, are, and will always remain, the ideal for which all of us and those who come after us must be resolved to sacrifice.

THE NEW DARK AGES?

R. H. S. Crossman

THE events of recent months in Germany have probably made the title "The New Dark Ages" exceptionally topical. The more I study both the theory and the practice of Fascism, the more I realize that in so far as its philosophy and ideas are concerned it is, to put it in its theological terms, the anti-Christ, since it negates at every point the philosophy both of Christianity and of Democracy as well.

One of the guiding lines of the development of our civilization has been the growth of a strong rational tradition and the conquest of superstition. But Fascism is organized superstition. Another principle both of Christianity and of the democratic tradition is the idea of personal equality. But Fascism not only imposes an iron dictatorship, and segregates the leadership from the rank and file, but states that such a segregation is the only virtuous course to adopt. Or lastly, consider the international field. However much we may have failed, I think we can recognize in the history of Europe since 1400 a growing movement to break down international barriers, a growing attempt to make a co-operative drive for freedom. But when we turn to

Fascism we find not only the hardening of nationalist sentiments but the positive glorification of the international anarchy. Think of those pogroms which are going on now. Although the ruffians have been removed from the streets the pogrom from the centre is still proceeding. And in Central Europe it is spreading through Poland and what was once democratic Czechoslovakia down to Hungary and Roumania. There is hardly a country in Europe in which a Jew can feel that he is secure in his freedom. A little incident, which was recorded in a letter recently sent me from Berlin, indicates the return of barbarism in Germany. A Jew writing to me said: "The thing which struck me most of all was the sight of a buxom German mother girding at her small child for not getting his hand through the grille of a jeweller's shop."

But the difference from the Dark Ages is that this pogrom is not merely a spontaneous, ignorant, superstitious rising of the common man. It is organized by the State itself. Even though in pre-War Russia the State organized pogroms, it did not exactly boast of the fact. It pretended that they were unorganized. Our epoch has brought not the return of barbarism in the sense of the return of anarchy and the break-down of law and order and civil authority, but the organized imposition of barbaric thought and barbaric practices upon civilized peoples; or, if you like it better, the scientific application of irrationalism. For in the modern Nazi State we see one of the greatest pieces of scientific

control and planning which the world has ever witnessed. There is no sign there of a relapse into dark ages such as occurred when the Roman Empire fell. Then civilization really broke down; the secrets of science were destroyed, and men lived once again in villages from hand to mouth. But under National-Socialism we see an all-powerful state organized for the purpose not of civilizing but of destroying what we consider to be civilization. In many ways it might be preferable if civilization were breaking up and we were going back to a simple primitive life. But civilization, in one sense, is not breaking up. The power of scientific control is increasing steadily; only in the Fascist countries it is itself controlled by barbaric forces.

One of the tragedies of the German nation is that of all the nations of Europe it has the greatest capacity for scientific organization. An Englishman who went to Germany on an important mission in the course of the winter of 1918-19, told me the other day that what astounded him in that starving country, even after the Armistice, was the national control of economics, which had been introduced during the War. He spoke, for instance, of the regulations under which every housewife had to save the stones of all fruit she and her family ate. Those stones were collected and 50,000 tons of oil was extracted from them. He mentioned the fact that when potatoes were peeled, every bit of the peel was collected and from thence was sent out—and this seemed to be the most remarkable piece of organization

—not to any and every farmer but only to those farmers who had cows which produced milk. He recalled that, when he went to the *Markthalle* in Berlin, he watched the men who were sorting the potatoes before they were sold, throw them into different piles. First, the pile of rotten potatoes which here would be thrown away but which in Germany were being carefully sorted out and stored as fertilizers. Then he noticed that the potatoes with small sprouts on them were put aside. Later the sprouts were carefully cut off for some further scientific use. My friend told me he was convinced from that day that of all the nations of Europe the German, above all, had the capacity to organize Europe either for peace or for war. But he felt, even in 1918-19, that the chances that Germany would organize Europe for peace were very small, for he was there during the time when Rosa Luxemburg was shot. I only mention that as a reminder that the Nazi *Wehrwirtschaft* is no new thing, but simply the re-introduction in a perfected form of the War-time economy of Germany.

Again, notice how we progress in civilization! Even Imperial Germany with all her military parades never dared before the Great War started to introduce a war-time economy. Now, in a period of peace, a whole nation is dragooned, a whole nation's economic and industrial system is perfected for one aim, and one aim alone—power. And once an economic and political system of that sort is in being, no promises solemnly

New Tyrannies for Old

proclaimed after each conquest, will prevent that machine functioning efficiently.

How has it come about that out of that 1918 period, when every common man in every nation wanted peace, and after twenty years of the League, there has arisen in Germany this monstrous war organization? I was very young in 1918 but even I remember as a schoolboy the feeling that a new world was being born. I have often since felt that the poet, the late W. B. Yeats, in one of his poems, written some years before the coming of Fascism, spoke of Fascism itself. In that poem he describes how all mankind is looking for a Second Coming, whether we picture it as an earthly deliverance or as some sort of transcendental deliverance. At the end of the War everybody felt something new must come.

THE SECOND COMING

Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, . . .
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Surely some revelation is at hand;
Surely the Second Coming is at hand.
The Second Coming! Hardly are those words out
When a vast image out of *Spiritus Mundi*
Troubles my sight: somewhere in sands of the desert
A shape with lion body and the head of a man,

The New Dark Ages?

A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun,
Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it
Rroll shadows of the indignant desert birds.
The darkness drops again; but now I know
That twenty centuries of stony sleep
Were vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle,
And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

The rough beast slouching to be born, was born in
1933.

INTERNAL COLLAPSE IN THE DEMOCRACIES

And now I turn my attention from Fascism, which we all like denouncing, to another form or relapse of civilization which has been occurring in the democratic countries. My criticism of the Western democratic Powers is this. We have all talked about collective security, and practised collective pacifism. We have all talked of the noble ideal of standing together and driving out the devil, but each of us has made friends with the devil provided he proceeded to clean up not our house but our neighbour's. We have done that on each occasion, expressing either Christian or democratic or any other sort of high moral reason for our action. It is far too mild to say that the Western democratic Powers have been defeated, when the truth is that the ruling classes in England and France have betrayed Democracy.

During the Munich interlude, I observed a profound difference between the attitude of the educated classes and of the ordinary working people of this country, which confirmed a remark which Léon Blum made two years ago. He said : "It is only the parties of the Left which have any patriotism left. The parties of the Right put their class before their nation, whether they do it consciously or not." Now a Democracy in which the educated leadership has collapsed is a Democracy which cannot function successfully. It is no good being sentimental and saying that Democracy depends altogether on the fundamental decency of the ordinary man. Unfortunately, for good or for ill, every sort of Government depends far more fundamentally on the virtues of the comparatively few who hold responsible positions in the country's life and culture and industry and education.

Perhaps the word "Baldwinism" sums up better than any other the attitude of the so-called educated classes in this country, both to international and to domestic affairs. Certainly Earl Baldwin represents, better than any other single statesman, the collapse of British Democracy. His very virtues are the virtues of a degenerate Democracy. One of the most typical features of his philosophy is a delightful impartiality between two sides, one of which is entirely in the right and the other entirely in the wrong, and one of which has one thousand per cent more strength than the other. If there is a statesman who has followed in the steps of Earl

Baldwin and learned his philosophy it is Lord Runciman. The "mediation" which he perpetrated in Czecho-Slovakia was true to every principle of Baldwinian policy. It took the form of saying, "We will mediate between the small man and an enormous bully," and then going to the small man and saying, "Now you must give up so-and-so and so-and-so," without demanding anything of the big man at all, but at the same time letting it be known that we might not support the small man in case the big man attacked him. Then when we had extracted all we could from the small man by "mediation," the big man wanted still more, so we scrapped "mediation" and became active assistants in the destruction of the small man.

I am not saying that this is a stupid policy, but only that, even if it is a clever thing to do, it is not good for democracies to do it. It cannot be good for a democracy to demean itself in that way. Whether we consider the Abyssinian problem or the Czecho-Slovak problem we shall find precisely the same behaviour; an apparent defence of the innocent party with an understanding all the time that there will be no effort to stop the aggressor if he really means business. That is called impartiality! And, of course, there is a more refined form of Baldwinism in international affairs now known as non-intervention.

But it is not only in international affairs that our leaders show this strict impartiality between the strong and the weak, the good and the bad. This attitude,

which can be summed up as preaching Christianity while preserving your own security and possessions, is the prevalent form of policy practised in this country. I cannot tell you how magnificent it is that the British middle classes should be so Christian and sympathetic to the unemployed. I cannot tell you how much the Czechs appreciated that after we had betrayed them we poured money into the Mansion House Fund. But a Democracy which thinks that it is defending Democracy by sending splints to those whose injuries are solely due to betrayal by it, has betrayed its own spirit; and the sending of the splints, necessary as it is, is making matters worse, if it satisfies our consciences.

Let me remind you that this mood was not prevalent during the growth of Democracy. In the great period during which the British middle class was fighting for its rights there was a spirit of determination; there was a courage and conviction which would make the people of those days, from the days of Cromwell right up to the end of the nineteenth century, spit in our faces if they saw what we were doing. It is completely untrue that Democracy cannot act quickly, that Democracy cannot be strong, that Democracy cannot follow leaders. Democracies have done it time after time in the past, and the greatest period of European culture was a period when democracies were not content with mere expressions of goodwill but despised "morality" when it meant selfish protection of one's own security.

The New Dark Ages?

THE EXISTING SITUATION

Looking at the inner political problems in this country from 1918 until 1938, I ask myself what great scheme, what great piece of national reconstruction has been carried through in the teeth of the opposition of the respectable and decent vested interests. Where do we see something of which we can say, as the Russian people can say, "We have done it"? What have we done since the War? Slum clearance? As a city councillor I know something of the way in which we carry through our building programme, in which we permit towns to be ruined by the sprawling abroad of bungalowoid growth, by the unplanned permission to private enterprise to wreck the countryside and inveigle poor working-class people into buying unsightly houses. Is that a piece of great democratic national reconstruction, or is it a piece of reconstruction which has been botched at every point by conceding to vested interests here and there, trading on no single person's corns, except those of the public? Are not we in danger of believing that the preservation of democratic rights means permitting vested interest always to prevail over public good, because public rights are the only rights which are not represented in Parliament? Every other vested interest is there—electricity, coal, steel. But where is the public? Nowhere, because when the Cabinet does put forward a Bill in the public interest it makes concession after concession in Committee to

the sinister interests, until there is nothing left except good intentions, and no action is taken.

Why did Democracy collapse abroad? Because Fascists were able to say the things I am saying. A lot of their criticism was correct, for Democracy is decadent when every effort to put the common before the private good is stultified by our democratic representatives. Look, for instance, at the problem of air raid precautions. You would think that here, if anywhere, public good could prevail against vested interest and vested lethargy and vested stupidity. Do you think it a credit to British Democracy that we have been unable during three years to produce any adequate defence of the civilian population? "Oh," you say, "but Hitler had a long start." Did he? When did Hitler start rearmament in earnest? About 1935. So did we. "But," you say, "in Democracy we cannot do these things." Cannot we ever do that in a Democracy? Is it a serious defence of Democracy to say, "Well, we can never do anything properly, thoroughly, and for the ordinary people"?

Take one other instance—the preservation of the beauty of our sea-coasts. We watch year after year, mile after mile of our coasts being ruined in perpetuity. By what? By the belief that the ordinary man who owns private property has the right to foul the public nest. Unlike Mr. Chamberlain's remarks about "fouling the nest" there is some truth in the statement that the ordinary man, be he rich or poor—most of the poor

are unable to do it—can foul the most perfect bay in Cornwall or Walcs if he can get hold of the land.

If Democracy cannot tackle that problem, which is only a minor one, can it ever tackle any major problem? And is there any good in our saying that it is because we are democrats that we cannot do those things when we see what democrats have achieved in other countries? One of the greatest schemes of social reconstruction is being carried through by the New Zealand Labour Party in a country which is not blessed with the accumulated wealth which this country possesses.

To sum up, we have passed in this country beyond the stage of imperialism. We are no longer on the advance, because the ruling class, the comfortable people who feel they are the nation (for if the mass say anything different they are always anti-national) is no longer imperialist. They are smugly retaining what they have and they do not think it worth doing anything else. The dynamic of their imperialism has gone just as the dynamic of our democratic movement is in danger of going. Fascism is the greatest organized movement of imperialism which the world has ever seen. Far more powerful, far more drastic, far more ruthless than the haphazard anarchic imperialism of Britain and France in the nineteenth century; far more purposeful and, in one sense, far more democratic, for it has the mass of the people, to a very great extent, behind it. Unless we do something to prevent it, there is no doubt whatever that in future Europe will be planned and controlled

by Fascism, and the Unholy German Empire will be the next stage after the period of the Versailles Conference.

Turn back to Versailles. In 1918 the great democracies, Great Britain, France, and America, had the world at their feet. They could mould Europe. They could mould the colonial empires. The tragedy was that nobody wanted to mould the world. The desire was to get back as quickly as possible to before 1914. Instead of organizing Europe for peace, and organizing the colonial empires for the good of the natives, what was done? The statesmen put forward a number of democratic phrases; permitted a few idealists to get a few boundaries rectified, and retained for France and Great Britain their pre-War empires. Do not forget that at Versailles when the Japanese delegate mildly suggested that perhaps President Wilson's democratic ideals were incomplete without a mention of racial equality, Great Britain and America said that that was going a little too far.

What we did at Versailles, and did under the banner of Democracy, is now being done by Fascism. The people who have risen against the Versailles dictum now boast of inequality of race. They glory in what we actually did. We had not the foresight to get rid of the narrow nation-state but created a lot more and thereby a host of economic difficulties. Against us there is now a form of organization solely concerned with the power of the nation-state. We tried to cover our imperialism

under the magnificent name of "mandate." They now are demanding empires and not even bothering to pretend that they are going to be mandated. Fascism is really a distorted reflection of the practices of the great imperial democracies at Versailles.

That brings me to a principle of Democracy. It is not possible to defend the democratic *status quo*. For Democracy is a movement which is either dynamic, or dead. It cannot stay put. In Versailles we tried to keep Democracy put, just as it was in 1914; and, of course, we failed. As a result a great movement against Versailles could find a moral justification for its aggression by pointing to our practices and asking how they square with our fine theories.

It is easier, because it is closer, to care intensely about the plight of Pastor Niemöller than it is to bother about Kenya or Jamaica. But there is something in it when Hitler asks: "Why are you so passionately against my oppression? Are there ten thousand people demonstrating in Trafalgar Square against the cruelties in Trinidad?" It is the latent hypocrisy in our nature which is the weakness of Democracy at present. We just want to keep what we have got.

It is worse than that. We tend to regard Fascism as entirely a reactionary movement. Those of us who do that, those who try to suggest that it is merely monopoly capitalism or the old Kaiserism in a new form are blinding ourselves to the real danger of National-Socialism, which is that it is not simply the old German

militarism or the old monopoly capitalism, but a new form of revolutionary nationalism organized to the *n*th degree. We have to face the fact that in Germany the National-Socialists have done for foul ends many things which we ought to have done here for good ends. They have defeated the capitalists, got control of investments, and control of the distribution of raw material to the factories in Germany; got control of currency, and regulated foreign trade. They have in *Kraft durch Freude* built a holiday movement which is real. They have knocked out the old ruling oligarchy and in that sense they have been a revolutionary movement. That is the tragedy: that when we do not do the things we ought to do for right and peaceful ends, somebody does the selfsame things for the most venomous and ghastly ends. But the things are done.

THE TASK

What could not we do in this country, we as Socialists, if we believed as the Nazis believe, that we *could* get control of investments and that we were going to get it; that we could get control of finance and foreign trade. If in this country democratic forces do not have a spirit which says, "We know what has got to be done; we have the power to do it; we have the people behind us, so we will get a move on and it shall be done," *then someone else will do those things.*

We have that choice before us. If we choose freedom, we have got to organize this country. It has got to have

The New Dark Ages?

co-ordination of its economic forces, and a social programme of which we can be proud. We must cease saying that it is far in advance of other countries in social legislation when, as the richest *rentier* country in the world, it is lagging behind. We have got to get that feeling because there is no other way, in peace or in war, of preserving the country.

The only question which really faces us to-day is: *Who* is going to do those things and for what end are they going to be done? We are beginning to realize, how much depends on the moral purpose of the statesman. We used just to say, "Well, statesmen are determined by economic law." What the success of Fascism and Communism proves is that man can conquer economics and he can use the economic system either for barbarous aggression or for raising the standard of living, bringing peace and prosperity.

The really profound difference between Germany and Russia does not lie in the form of totalitarian state, which in certain ways is closely similar, but in the dynamic of the Communist and the National-Socialist movements. Whereas the Communist movement has from its earliest days stood for the *ideals* of Liberalism; whereas it has sprung out of the liberal European tradition, whereas when you read Marx you realize that no one had a more passionate humanity, a more sincere love of his fellow-men and belief in liberty—he may have had a strange way of expressing it, but he had the belief—and whereas Russia, in spite of every

difficulty, is still moved by that social purpose, you find in Germany an entirely different purpose not emanating now from the people but imposed on the people by a group who hold that the people are as slaves and must remain as slaves; that it is their duty to serve; that the nation, the tribe, is the end-all and be-all.

Do not let us, then, make the mistake of saying that the difference between these two is to be found only in a difference between their economies. There are big differences, but you can have much the same economic system and it can be used in entirely different ways. It is what you want to do with the economic system which really matters; and what the statesman wants to do depends on whether he is cut off from the people. No statesman who is cut off from the people by a leadership principle can any longer want anything but power. It is power which corrupts him. The only way in which this terrifying scientific power which is at the disposal of the statesman to-day for the good of the people can be used properly is if he is the spokesman of a democratic movement. My criticism of Russia is precisely on that point. Do its rulers retain the early Communist purpose? I hope they do. But however that may be, at least they once had it, and the Nazis never had it.

"Ah," you say, "we cannot do these things in England." Why cannot we? There is a bigger possibility of a democratic revolutionary movement in this country

The New Dark Ages?

than in any country in the world. The materials are all there. But what we see is corruption in political leadership, lack of dynamic, lack of morale. We need to get that courage back. We all know what has got to be done. All that is needed is that somebody shall believe it can be done: then it will be done.

That is the answer to the question: Are the new Dark Ages upon us? They are upon us if we cannot regain our faith in the popular revolutionary democratic movement. They are gone if we cannot stand the jeers, gibes, and curses of respectable people. They are gone if we cannot see that even 1906 Liberals were not quite respectable in their own day. We cannot move unless we can regain our moral indignation, coupled with faith in the power of the movement. That cannot be done without the active help of the educated classes. For you cannot have a democratic revolution unless the middle classes take an active part, not as self-appointed leaders but because they still believe in simple moral principles and still know that they can be realized in this country if we really mean to do it.

WHEN AND HOW A RENAISSANCE?

The Rt. Hon. Herbert Morrison, M.P.

It is the case, as Dr. Edith Summerskill has said, not only that there are a series of important countries in Europe under dictatorial Government, but all of us feel that we might conceivably move in a similar direction. That, possibly, France might go the same way. I believe there is reason to think that Great Britain is least liable to become a Fascist dictatorship, partly because of the length and experience of political Democracy and representative Government here, the fairly high capacity of the British people for public administration under conditions of self-government, and partly because in this country there are long traditions of individual liberty. Such long traditions of individual liberty that they in themselves have presented something of a problem to the Socialist, because many people have not yet learned that Socialism is the best way of expressing and securing and establishing individual liberty in the highest and finest sense of the term. So one may be hopeful that this country, which previously in its history has stood aside from a dark and dreary Europe and survived unhappy events, may do so again. But we cannot be sure. We must keep

When and How a Renaissance?

watch not only upon our opponents but upon ourselves in order to see that the public work we do, the way in which we do it, and the spirit in which we do it is best likely to preserve democratic self-government not only in form but in such a way that it will be respected by the general mass of the population.

For we must remember that the mass of the population cannot be relied upon to preserve Democracy purely for theoretical considerations and because from their political knowledge and acumen they believe that Democracy is a sacred thing that should not be tampered with. The mass of the population is not so theoretical as that. It is not so concerned with political abstractions and political doctrines as such. What people as a mass are concerned about is certainly their liberty. Certainly they have an instinct for democratic government. Certainly the British hold as a sacred right—and I think they are correct in doing so—the right to tell the Government of the day, whatever its political complexion, to go to the devil. But if it were the case that Democracy did not deliver the goods, if Democracy was condemned, after years, as being inefficient, slow, and ineffective; if it could not preserve for our people or secure for them reasonable social security and a fair standard of life; if it was incapable of preserving the security of the country; if, in short, judged on superficial tests of what is good and what is not good, Democracy failed those standards, then Democracy would not be safe.

It is, therefore, not enough to denounce tyranny and Fascism. It is not enough to criticize and expose our political opponents. We have to demonstrate by our own action, by our own capacity and administration, by our own work, that Democracy can succeed, that Democracy can give as good and efficient government as any other system and, if possible, better; and that Democracy can ensure a happy country, and, within the powers of any individual state, secure a peaceful and a prosperous world. Therefore, let us get beyond the point of mere abstract affirmation of the desirability of Democracy and of mere denunciation of Fascism and the exposure of its shortcomings, its tyrannies and so on. There is a responsibility upon every one of us to make our contribution to the successful working of Democracy in the interests of the whole of the nation and as our country's contribution to the well-being of the world as a whole.

One of the things that worries me about His Majesty's present advisers is not only that I think their policy is wrong. I do. What worries me also is their indecision, their inefficiency, their lack of capacity to come to conclusions and pursue intelligible policies. It has been so in foreign affairs. It is so really in domestic economic affairs, although not so noticeable just now in relatively good conditions of trade, notwithstanding the existence of two million unemployed. Their imperfections will be more noticeable in conditions of economic slump and difficulty. But in foreign affairs there is indecision, lack

of clarity, lack of intelligible objectives. Recently the members of the House of Commons have been discussing Palestine, where threequarters of the trouble that exists in what might be a very happy country, but is now a difficult country, has been unnecessary. It has been the result of indecision, the result of giving the impression that people have only got to manifest signs of violence and force and the British lion cringes—if, indeed, he does not run.

It is this inefficiency, the lack of strength in Government, the lack of capacity, that are even more alarming in the ministers of to-day than the civil of their policy. I would almost sooner that their parliamentary policy was intelligibly black, clear-cut and firm than I would that they should be wobbling all over the place and manifesting signs of sheer incapacity in the art of government. If that condition goes on long enough, either in the Government of to-day or in any alternative Government of to-morrow, it is a real danger to Democracy. That is the kind of thing that will give the masses of the people almost a case to say, “Well, Democracy has failed and we are going to try something else.”

What makes me most unhappy about France is the fact that there has not evolved for some years a strong, firm democratic Government that knows what it is doing and why it is doing it. That is one of the difficulties about a combination Government, even the Popular Front of France. Owing to the fact that it is a combina-

tion of people who are not fundamentally agreed about what they are getting at and why, a coalition of that kind, nominally formed to save a country from a threat of Fascism, may, if it is weak, if it collapses in confusion, if it merely makes muddle, be not only the Government that was the alternative to Fascism at the beginning, but if care is not taken to avoid it, may be the cause of Fascism at the end.

But I am hopeful about France, too. Not for the same reasons that I am, in the qualified sense, hopeful about our country, but because, somehow, the principles of the French Revolution of 1789 still live in the hearts of the French people and because, when troubles arise and when threats come, the French, at any rate, are willing to go out on the boulevards of Paris and risk their heads in a fight for liberty and a stand against tyrannical government.

So let us have qualified hopes that British and French liberty may survive. But the best way for it to survive, as the Fabian executive have evidently contemplated, is that we should find means whereby the dictatorships which now exist should pass, and that the peoples of the Fascist countries should regain their liberty, should re-establish representative government, and should once more be in a condition to co-operate with the people's of other countries for the good of the world as a whole.

In the meantime Fascism in Germany and in Italy has been positively strengthened and added to by the general policy of our own Government since 1931.

peoples of all other countries, including the countries of dictatorship; enough courage, enough efficiency and enough determination to command the respect, the faith and the admiration of the peoples of the dictatorship Powers.

If we ask ourselves, honestly, whether there is anything in British policy in the world since 1931, or in the conduct of that policy, which is enough to command the respect and enthusiasm of the people of Germany and Italy, the sad and unhappy answer is in the negative. That is a pity. I would sooner it had been otherwise, even though it would limit one's speeches of denunciation of the Government of the day! For I, and I hope you, feel more concerned about the happiness and well-being of the world than about having the pleasure of being able to denounce the incompetence and wickedness of our political opponents. Therefore, it is vitally important that by the quality of our policy, by the height of our moral purpose, by our kindliness, by our understanding but also by our strength and our efficiency and courage, the peoples of Germany and Italy and Japan should be able to say to themselves—though they may at first be doubtful about our political system—that they like and respect the British. So with the power of the peoples and the Governments of the other democratic states. Because until the respect of the peoples of other countries, including the countries of dictatorship, has been won it will not be possible to exercise upon them that beneficent influence which is

vital to the re-creation of Democracy in those countries. Why should they be enthusiastic about Democracy when they see that in the democratic countries there is a failure to exercise the responsibilities of government and to elevate those moral factors in leadership which are vital to successful political action?

If the peaceful Powers are to command the respect of those other countries, including their Governments, policy must show some collective discipline among themselves. To-day they are a scattered disconnected army. In foreign policy the democratic Powers are exercising a negligible influence over the affairs of the world when, in fact, they could be exercising a decisive and preponderant influence. The democratic and peaceful Powers between them represent the vast majority of mankind; they have the vast preponderance of military, naval, and aerial strength, the vast preponderance of economic strength and, if only it is utilized, the vast preponderance of political capacity. The trouble is that they are scattered, disconnected, each going more or less its own way. And the one country that is in the best position to lead them towards cohesion and sanity, namely, Great Britain, is not only refusing that noble task among the democratic and peaceful Powers of the world but is, on the contrary, pursuing another course which by encouraging and aiding and abetting aggression, as it has done in a sense in China, in Abyssinia, and notably in Spain, which is the most scandalous and suicidal of the lot, is not only breaking up the unity of

the democratic and peaceful states but is playing the game of the Fascist dictatorial Powers.

Therefore, my second answer is that the change may come in the Fascist countries when their peoples see that they cannot go on with this policy of aggression; that it is too dangerous, too disastrous; when it is clear to them that they are up against a great body of powerful nations not wishing to hurt them or to crush them, who do not even want forcibly to restrain them, but are determined that the combination of peaceful Powers is going to be a fine enthusing working example of friendship and co-operation and that they are going to let it be known that they are determined to resist policies and actions which are turning what might be a world of peace into a world of anarchy and of threats.

It is of vital importance that our ministers should make the peoples of the dictatorship countries know that we have no thought of unkindliness towards them that we wish friendship with them; that we know that they are human beings as we are human beings; that they have problems as we have; that they have been in the past the victims of injustice which we are as a nation willing to make sacrifices, with others, to rectify. That we must make known. Otherwise we are merely ineffective in the call of the peoples for peace. We must get that to the peoples somehow.

Ministers have been doing, perhaps, a little too much exclusive talking to Governments abroad, and not enough to peoples. I do not accept the doctrine that

we cannot get our message to the peoples of other countries. The resources of civilization are not exhausted. There is the broadcast and other means. And as the Governments of the dictatorships are asserting the right to conduct propaganda for themselves all over the world, certainly we have an equally moral right, not to conduct propaganda but just to let the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan know what we are doing and what we are thinking.

Thirdly, the "When" will come when the peoples of the dictatorship Powers, with our help, see both the danger and the light. For it is true that if the mischievous aggressive activities of the Fascist Powers continue, if horrors such as have gone on in Germany in these recent weeks continue, they will arouse against the Government of Germany, and in the end, against the people of Germany the moral reprobation of the world; and if the race of competitive national rearmament continues long enough the result of those things together can only be one—i.e. war. It must come if that competition indefinitely continues, even if the Governments do not intend it to happen. I do not think the British Government wishes war to happen. I am not fully convinced that Herr Hitler wants to be involved in a first-class war. It is a terrible risk for any dictatorship to be involved in a first-class war. But we are playing with fire all the time. The armaments are mounting. The tyranny, the persecution, the cruelty is growing. The moral indignation of the rest of the

world is growing. It is not always possible to control vast military machines. It is not always possible to avoid the incidents that may cause war, or to be sure in face of the continuance of a policy of threat, threat, threat, and the policy of pointing the revolver at the head and the heart, that somebody may not one day say in a state of nervous exasperation, "All right, shoot." That is what is facing the people of Germany. If they get there with world opinion against them, despite the fact that the other countries may have a nasty time for a week or two—and they would—Germany would go down.

This must be got to the German people, not as a threat, but as an apprehension on our part. I do not want British democracy to be defeated in war, nor do I want Germany defeated for the second time within a limited number of years. Germany has a great contribution to make to the culture and the beauty and the scientific knowledge of the world. I do not want that great country defeated for the second time, but she is moving that way. And if Herr Hitler and his colleagues go their way long enough, if they continue as they are long enough, they will plunge that great country into a war which in the long run must be, I believe, a disaster not only to Fascism, which I welcome, but a disaster to the people of Germany, which I do not welcome.

We want to convey to the people of the dictatorship Powers both the dangers of the situation and the light.

The light is that this can be a happy world, that this can be a prosperous world, that poverty and insecurity and the struggle of nations for a living and for markets is all so destructive and unnecessary; that if mankind will have reason and we co-operate as nations with each other, there is such a rich store of wealth in the world, such great scientific and industrial knowledge, that we can build, with no terrible difficulty, a world that is secure and comfortable and decent for every nation upon the surface of the earth.

But having conveyed to them the danger and the light it is still the case that the respect of the peoples of the dictatorships is not going to be commanded by leaderless, inefficient, cowardly, and dishonest democracies. The peoples of the dictatorship Powers are not going to respect a political leadership which has not the courage to lead; that is always waiting for millions of people to tell them what to do. That will not command respect by the people of the dictatorships. But they will respect a Democracy that is intelligent, that is courageously and efficiently led, and above all, a Democracy that succeeds. A democrat who fails is committing a crime not only against his political party but against Democracy itself. That is why the Government makes me apprehensive and nervous.

So let the democracies cease whining and protesting. Let them start doing things, achieving things and succeeding. And in Democracy I include you and me and the rest of us.

How can the renaissance come, not only in our own country in so far as we are involved, but in those other countries?

AT HOME

At home the force of example is exceedingly important. When a Government or a local authority carries through the promises which it has carefully made, having been careful not to promise anything unless it is reasonably sure it can do it—which is just as important as keeping the promises themselves and, indeed, makes it easier to keep them—when a Government or a local authority carries through its programme with reasonable speed, with smoothness, with a lack of muddle, and with a lack of confusion, what has it done? It has shown that representative Government and Democracy will work. If that is so in practice in our home affairs, then we have erected a great testimonial to the effectiveness of Democracy itself. The force of example is important to our own people by way of encouraging the retention of faith in Democracy on their part, but it is exceedingly powerful as an illustration to the peoples of the countries of dictatorship. The dictatorships do things—some things that are good, many that are bad. Indeed, however many things they do that are good, they are not sufficient compensation for the loss of the liberties of the people in doing them. But when the dictatorship Powers do anything that is good they advertise it thoroughly. I believe they are

right in advertising public administration. But, you know, in this country we generally do not advertise public administration.

As a sidelight on the force of example let me say that I have twice been to speak in the City of Carlisle at Labour meetings and have spent some spare time looking at the public houses and hotels of the State public-house trust. I do not argue whether I agree with State ownership or not, but as a piece of administration this is a first-class job of work. Well, do you ever hear Sir Samuel Hoare going about the country boasting about his State public houses and hotels in Carlisle? The Secretary of State for Scotland has got some in Scotland. You have heard Mr. Walter Elliot make various speeches on the interaction between armaments and the social services, and they have all been watched with great closeness and attention, but did you ever hear him when Scottish Secretary, boasting of the efficiency of his State-owned public houses in Scotland? Not at all. Why? Because it is a triumph of democratic State action, and as it is contrary to the advertised principles of the Conservatives, it is right and proper that they should say nothing about the State public-house trust.

Before there was a Labour majority at County Hall—and I am sure Mr. Emil Davies will agree with this—there were, in addition to the evil policies, many things that the old Conservative Council did that were good and important to the people of London. They even

spent about £2,000,000 a year on direct labour. They did not do enough good things and they did not do them well enough. Still they did some things that were good, but did you hear anything much about the London County Council in those days? You did not. It almost might not have existed. Why? Because the then Council feared to tell the people that public authority can be efficient. Those men at County Hall were largely dependent for what work they did on public officers employed by the Council, and said "Thank you" to them in Committee; and then they went on a public platform and said, "A municipal official cannot run a whelk stall." That kind of thing is wrong. It means that Democracy is discredited even by its own representatives. If Democracy makes a mess of a job it is right that that mess should be exposed. At County Hall we now, if we make a mistake, think it is right it should be exposed. Touch wood! We never do! But if we do good things week after week who is paying for those good things? The people of London. Who elected us to do the good things and gave us the chance? The people of London. Nay, more, who are we dependent upon next time to elect us to go on with the work? The people of London. So we at the County Hall said: Here is a great institution working in the service of the people of London, acting for them, doing a job of work for them, because the four and a quarter million cannot do it direct themselves. We are doing a good job, doing it at least as well as the gas and

electricity people. They are doing a pretty good job, and it is right that they should produce advertisements and films taking the public into their confidence, reconciling the public to their work, even reconciling them to Mr. Therm and the two-part tariff as they have done over a period. If it is right for business undertakings to do it, why should it not be right for an official public authority to take the people into its confidence and tell them what it is doing? So we have done so. We have advertised, not the Labour Party—that would be wicked, and I am serious when I say that—we have advertised public service. We have advertised the London County Council. We have carried out the principle that if the ratepayers pay, they have a right to know what they get for their money. The Press has a right to criticize, and it has done so, God bless it. The Press is, so to speak, an unparliamentary and sometimes mischievous representative of the ratepayers. The Press has the right to know everything we can reasonably tell it. Then if the newspapers go and write the story wrong, it is their business. Our business is to give them the facts. It used not to be so. The Press were kept at arm's length, not encouraged to go over the County Hall doorstep. Any journalist now, as long as he knows the ropes, knows where to enquire and does not engage in illegitimate practices, any journalist is now as welcome at County Hall as any other London citizen. It is right it should be so. Democracy must advertise. The citizens have a right

to know what their representatives are doing, except in fields where it would be agreed that it would be contrary to the public interest that premature publication should take place.

Well, that is part of the force of example, and it is important that the nations and the peoples should know. We must show that Democracy, idealism, and efficiency can live together. And they can. There is no necessity for conflict between them. The example of a practical and efficient political party of social vision is worth a thousand wordy resolutions denouncing the Government and expecting it to fall. The example of a well-led Government or local authority—public-spirited, and above all, tidy in its work and incorruptible, clean—is not less valuable than speeches and pamphlets denouncing Fascism and championing Democracy. It is all part of the force of example. The next Labour Government must not only be a Government. It must look like a Government, and subject to the House of Commons, act like a Government, with the rights of authority and power that ought to belong to Governments. The present Government is not doing that, but it ought to be doing it, even in the light of its own bad principles. If a Labour Government comes it must not only be a Government. It must walk about Britain like a Government. One of the first things I said to my people when Labour got a majority at County Hall was: "Remember, you are no longer a minority seeking concessions from the other side by

being politic and sometimes flattering them or by being impertinent. Subject to the electorate, you are now the governing power of London. Conduct yourselves accordingly. Walk about with a due sense of dignity in that position, remembering the while that you are in the service of the people."

All these things are necessary for the building of public faith in Democracy, not only at home, but necessary also for commanding the respect of peoples abroad.

Political and economic education is itself a contribution to the rights and responsibilities of a political rank and file. Political and economic education is profoundly important to the rank and file of the political party of the Left, and by "education" I do not merely mean teaching them how to prove that the party programme is right or that their leaders are right. By "education" I mean teaching them all the difficulties connected with public work; all the snags; all the awkward arguments about it. It is vitally important that that should be done, because if the rank and file do not know the snags and the awkward facts before they come to exercise power, they are liable to be knocked over when awkward facts meet them when they are in power. The ability honestly to face difficulties and to bring practical minds to bear are vitally important in the political and economic education of the rank and file of advanced movements.

We need orderly and balanced economic and social

progress if there is to be a successful Government of the Left. It is profoundly important that it shall not get into a muddle, that it shall not create chaos. Its policy must be such, and its administration should be such, that it provides no excuse for economic and financial disorder; it must be a Government of tidiness and good administration; on the other hand, if it meets people in the City or elsewhere who by illegitimate action, which in spirit is unconstitutional action, are seeking to upset the economic fabric of the State just as decisively as violent and forcible revolution would, then the representatives of Democracy must be ready to deal firmly and decisively with action of that kind, if that action comes.

Capitalism in itself is a force that is of the greatest danger to Democracy. Capitalism has no soul and no principles. It is liable to be unscrupulous in its methods when fighting in the last ditch. But as long as you have not only right on your side but efficiency and confidence, and as long as public opinion respects you, then you are in a position to deal with any rebellious capitalists or financial institutions. So it is important that capitalism itself shall go as soon as we can make it go. As long as capitalism exists, Democracy is not safe. So if any future Labour Government has up to a point to choose between socialization on the one hand and social reform on the other, I would have it choose socialization, because I think the sooner the nation is the decisive master of its economic resources, the sooner

When and How a Renaissance?

it will be emancipated from that dependence upon the capitalist, financial, and land-owning class which will be a danger to Democracy as long as that dependence exists.

ABROAD

I have very largely indicated my answer to "How, abroad?" in my earlier observations. By the maximum practicable co-operation among the peaceful democratic Powers, firstly in foreign policy; and not less important, in economic policy, the gradual breaking down of economic boundaries between countries. Co-operation in social policy, through the International Labour Office and otherwise, lifting by international agreement the standard of life of the workpeople. Colonial co-operation, by being willing that the really backward colonial territories shall be no longer nationally owned and nationally exploited for national capitalist ends, but shall be internationally administered primarily for the good of the native populations and, secondly, for the general good and satisfaction of the world as a whole.

If the British and the French, the Belgians and the Dutch, and the Portuguese and the others, are not willing that there shall be international administration and ownership of backward colonial territories, then they must not grumble if the countries who have no colonies are jealous of them and a constant source of danger to their position and their security. The giving

of colonies to Germany merely in order that she may nationally exploit them is not a solution of the colonial problem, and, of course, as we know from our own experience, not a solution of the German economic problem itself. The economic problem is much wider than the colonial problem. Otherwise, we would not have the distressed areas of South Wales, Lancashire, the North-East coast, and the West of Scotland. Moreover, the German Government cannot grumble too much if in the light of the way in which it has treated its Socialists, Trade Unionists, Co-operators, Communists, and Jews we are not quite sure that it would treat properly the native populations of colonial territories.

But this we must say, that we are anxious for co-operation over that very wide field. It must, I think, be accompanied by military co-operation as well. It is no good shirking that issue. We are living in a world of rather crude brutalities, and if the combination of peaceful Powers is to retain peace those Powers must have not only enough arms, but they must be efficient in their direction of their military organization. They must be so powerful collectively in the military sense that the Fascist aggressive minority will see that to start an attack would be to invite failure within a reasonable time, with the risk of the dictatorships coming down in the midst of revolution within those countries. Therefore, that military strength would exist for the purpose of avoiding war, and not for the purpose of starting

up war. It would only be for the purpose of protection on a collective basis in order to discourage aggressive action on the part of aggressive Powers.

But having said that, are we still to maintain a block of peaceful and democratic Powers in the world eternally separate from the Fascist aggressive Powers, Germany, Italy, and Japan? I hope not. For as long as that obtains there is always the risk of the powder going off and trouble blowing up. Therefore, it would be profoundly important that that vast powerful combination of the democratic and peaceful Powers with, I hope, their high moral leadership and their high note of appeal, should say, and say repeatedly in every conceivable way, to the peoples of Germany, Italy, and Japan: "This is not a combination against you. The door is open wide for Germany, Italy, and Japan to come in—wide open. We invite you to share in every advantage that we seek for ourselves—all the advantages, including your share of colonial administration. We ask for ourselves no opportunity that we are not prepared that you shall have. We are willing to examine and to be reasonable about every one of the grievances that you think you have. All we ask is that you come in as co-partners in the building of a peaceful and prosperous world. If you won't come in on a peaceful basis it is a tragedy for you and a tragedy for us, but we tell you we are prepared that you shall have justice and security, free and for nothing, equality of opportunity, free and for nothing, on the basis of peace. But, un-

happily, if you will not come, if you say you will only have justice and equality by fighting for them, that you will only have what you think you ought to have by pointing a pistol at us, we are sorry, we cannot do business with you. We cannot do trade with you. We cannot have normal social relations with you. And if you do attack, we shall resist with all the vast effective might that this combination of peaceful Powers has got. We must and we shall defeat aggression."

That is what disgusts me about Mr. Chamberlain. If he had to go to Berchtesgaden and to Munich he could have gone as representative of a vast combination of peaceful Powers. He could have spoken in those generous and noble terms, if I may say so, to the people of Germany. He could have had behind him not only the predominant military strength of a great combination, but—more important—a peace sentiment that could have been built up on the basis of Arthur Henderson's work in 1929-31. And he could have gone, not only as an equal, but as a moral leader of mankind in the world, because he could have had behind him all those great moral factors that are as important as sheer military power. Given a wise foreign policy since 1931, the Prime Minister could have done it. He did not. He had scattered the friends of peace. He went as the representative of a Britain that was just as semi-detached as a villa in a Tory suburb; and just about as impressive.

So we could build the renaissance. Because the time

would come when the people of Italy and Germany would begin to say to themselves—as indeed I expect some of them are saying already—do let us remember to distinguish between those Governments and their peoples, because it is a thousand to one the mass of the people are not bad; we have got to live with them; they are fellow-human beings, and unfortunately it is easier to start hating people than to get out of the habit—those people would begin to say, "Well, well, we can have peace. Our frontiers can be secured. We can have access to raw materials. We can have a lowering of the barriers which divide the economic life of one nation from another. We can have our share of colonial administration. We can have military co-operation and security. Not only that, but if we are in the peace combination we can get a reduction, progressively, of this vast terrible military expenditure that is lowering our standard of life and that of everybody else. We can have justice. We can have equality of opportunity. We can have the full dignity of a nation." The Germans could say, "We can have a resumption of German art, German science, and German culture that was famous in the world before the Nazi revolution. We can have it all free and for nothing—and without a war. Why have a war? Why is our Government constantly extolling the virtues of militarism? Why is it constantly telling us to be ready for a war when we can have all we want without a war? Why are we encircled? Who is encircling us?"

New Tyrannies for Old

Is it the Governments of Democracy or, come to think of it, is it our own Government which is encircling itself by its own policy?"

As soon as those peoples of the Fascist Powers know these things—and it is our business and our Government's business to help them to know them—when that happens the time begins to come when either Herr Hitler or Signor Mussolini or both must change their policy and their tune, or they will go, for in the end popular opinion can influence even dictatorships. Dictatorships cannot last if they really are acting against an informed and virile public opinion. The Fascist dictators would go and somebody else would come. Somebody better than they. A democratic regime might come. Well, would not that be a good thing?

But, you see, what worries Mr. Chamberlain is this. He does not like Herr Hitler too much or Signor Mussolini. He probably says: "Yes, they are disturbing people, but if they go, who comes? After all, Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini have put the trade unions in their place, and the political Labour Movement, and the Co-operative Societies." If you were a nice class-conscious capitalist of the Chamberlain type would not you, subconsciously, have a little sympathy with Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini? If you saw them going, would not you wonder whether those who were coming in their place would be as "sound"? You would; and, therefore, like Mr. Chamberlain, you

would not be in a hurry that they should go. And that is what is the matter with Mr. Chamberlain.

The good news must be got to the peoples of the dictatorships. Speeches by ministers. Keep making them, keep speaking in the right tone, in the right spirit, to Germany and Italy; not as a governess, even though that allegation may not be wholly true, but as a friend, as a fellow-human being, and if he is a Socialist minister, as the man who wants to see a new world and a new civilization in which Germans, ordinary working-class Germans, can have a good time as well as British working-class people. Speeches. Pronouncements. International conferences. Invite them. Conduct diplomacy, at any rate a great deal of it, in the open, by sending them collective notes not of reproach, not of abuse, but notes that say: "Come on; let's get together. Let's reform this warlike world. Let's get peace." Publish them. They will get there sooner or later. Broadcast them—in good German and in good Italian. I spent a year trying to persuade this Government to broadcast, not propaganda but news. At last they are beginning to do it. Let us go on doing it, because the news will filter through in some way. The tragedy of Fascism is that the peoples of those countries are encircled as far as their Governments can encircle them, with a view to preventing them knowing what other peoples are thinking and doing. Our duty to our own country, our duty to the people of Germany and Italy and of the world is to see that they do know as

much as possible about the real facts of the world, and what the peoples of the world are seeking. Let us help them to understand that every one of us desires to live in the most complete friendship, peace, and co-operation with the peoples of these great nations.

Moreover, I am not sure that the functions of the Secret Service ought not to be reviewed. I do not know whether we get entire value for our money. It is said, and I think with some truth, that the British Secret Service is the finest in the world. Somehow it does not have a nice flavour in our Socialist mouths. But I can imagine some good work for the Secret Service in these more modern and difficult conditions, and when foreign political agencies are operating here. The problem is both to avoid war and to promote the triumph of reason and liberty. In this work our own Labour and Socialist International, knocked about, bruised, by these comings of dictatorship in country after country—and now Czecho-Slovakia is out for tactical reasons for the moment, but it may mean more serious reasons later—our Labour and Socialist International needs overhauling, modernizing in its methods. It needs to be more capable of swift interchange of information between the parties of the various countries, more swift in exchange of experiences, in order that policy can speedily be agreed in the interests of World Socialism and Democracy.

Still, in the end, as I said earlier, Labour's big task remains to win at home in this Britain of ours—with

its great possibilities and its great contribution in the past to political Democracy, to libertarian causes and to the art and technique of public administration—decisive power so that Britain may play her part in the building of a sensible and rational world. The most direct contribution that you and I can make is that of making Britain safe, not merely for Democracy, but safe for the Labour Party and, above all, safe for that Socialism without which we can never ever be secure in our democratic heritage.

Every one of us has a personal responsibility. We have an individual duty to our country and to all humanity. I ask you in no nagging spirit to ask yourselves what you are doing about it. Are you doing something positive in our political life, in the constituencies, in the humble life of the Labour movement? Are you doing things? Can you say that you are doing things which are going to contribute to the altering of the face of the world by altering the political policy of your country? Are you really working in an orderly way? Are you wandering around with the diversionists, or are you getting on with the job? It is important that everybody should ask themselves these questions. For there are many—I am not grumbling at them—moved by I am not quite sure what, perhaps pure abstract intellect and sometimes pure abstract heart, and Heaven knows which is the most dangerous; moved from one enthusiasm to another; from one sparkling remedy to another, caught by the latest invention of some magic

solution or the latest invention of some shocking revelation about somebody or something. That may add to the zest of life, but it is not enough. We must each ask ourselves: What am I doing?

It is not enough to read reviews. By all means read them, but remember that they have their ups and downs and their moves this way and that from week to week. That is part of their charm. That is why we like reading them. But not only read reviews. Review yourselves also, for we who are Socialists belong not alone to ourselves. We are, if we are real Socialists, the instruments of a finer purpose. It is not enough that we mentally enjoy ourselves; not enough that we should be happy in reading diverting books. It is also necessary that we in our lives shall contribute to the changing of the face of the earth and the building of a new and better world.

THE FABIAN SOCIETY

(Established 1883)

Hon. Treasurer:

ALDERMAN A. EMIL DAVIES
J.P., L.C.C.

Hon. Secretary:

EDWARD R. PEASE

THE chief object to which the Society devotes its resources is the education of the people in political, economic, and social subjects. To effect this purpose it must in the first place educate itself by the discussion of those problems which from time to time appear ripe for solution. Its members therefore undertake the study of such problems and lay the results before the Society, where they are considered from various points of view. Finally, the conclusions adopted or generally approved by the members are published, usually in pamphlet form, and by this means made available for the information of all. Nearly 300 such pamphlets have been issued to date.

The Society further endeavours to promote social amelioration by the dissemination of information about existing institutions, in order that better use may be made of the powers already possessed by local administrative authorities, now too often neglectful of their obligations.

Full particulars of all the undertakings of the Society are recorded in the Annual Report, which includes an audited account of the receipts and expenditure. This Report, and the other publications of the Society, can be obtained of the Secretary, who will be glad to give any other information desired.

F. W. GALTON
Secretary

M



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
LEIPZIG: (F. VOLCKMAR) HOSPITALSTR. 10
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
TORONTO: 95 WELLINGTON STREET, WEST
BOMBAY: 15 GRAHAM ROAD, BALLARD ESTATE
WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 8 KINGS CRESCENT, LOWER HUTT
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: AUSTRALIA HOUSE, WYNYARD SQUARE